CANADIAN THESES

THÈSES CANADIENNES

ABBOTT, Laurence Michael

TEACHERS' CONCEPTIONS OF CITIZENSHIP: EXAMINING ...

ISBN 978-0-494-33166-8

MR-33166

University of Alberta

Teachers' Conceptions of Citizenship: Examining Teachers' Approaches to a Contested Concept across Discipline Boundaries

by

Laurence Michael Abbott

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Education

Department of Secondary Education

Edmonton, Alberta
Fall 2007

Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-33166-8
Our file Notre référence
ISBN: 978-0-494-33166-8

NOTICE:
The author has granted a non-exclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or non-commercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:
L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

For Brenda, Hannah and my Parents and Family;
Thank you for your support and encouragement.

Abstract

One of the central aims of public education is helping students develop a personal sense of citizenship. Teachers in all disciplines have a critical responsibility to provide the guidance and environment conducive to the cultivation of good citizenship in their students. However, citizenship, especially what it means to teach for good citizenship, is remarkably difficult to articulate. This study explores how six teachers in an urban high school in Alberta understand the notion of citizenship and what it means to teach for good citizenship. Using a qualitative case study approach, participants were asked about their own understanding of the notion of citizenship, its role in education within each participant's subject area, and its place within the whole curriculum. Participants were challenged to reflect on how each of them could make their subject area into a space that fosters a more just and inclusive conception of citizenship in their school and community.

Acknowledgements

Although the production of this thesis has been a significant personal accomplishment, there are a number of people whose assistance and participation made this endeavour possible:

Dr. George Richardson, my MEd program supervisor. Thank you for all the guidance, assistance, feedback and advice. Thank you for reading draft after draft after draft, and for offering me the opportunity to participate in research and scholarship beyond the specific focus of my master's thesis.

Dr. Terry Carson, Dr. Kent den Heyer and Dr. Amy von Heyking, who, along with Dr. George Richardson, made up my MEd oral exam committee. Thank you for spending the time reading my work and for providing me with a lot of helpful feedback and for giving me a great deal to think about and consider.

Alison, Beth, Caroline, Diane, Alan and Brad – pseudonyms for the teachers who participated in this study. Thank you for agreeing to participate in this study, for finding the time to sit down with me for an interview, and for allowing me the opportunity to explore and understand each of your personal insights.

All of my professors and fellow graduate students for making me feel at home in this department and for helping me to join in on-going conversations on curriculum, citizenship education and teacher education, and for helping me to establish a trajectory for future scholarship.

I wish to express my gratitude to everyone in the Secondary Education office. I appreciate everything that all of you have done to make my life as a graduate student worry-free.

I must also thank Dr. Arvind Koshal and his surgical team; happily, I see evidence of their work every day.

I would like to thank my parents, Daniel Abbott and Sharon Abbott and all of my family and friends for all of their support and encouragement.

Hannah, thank you for sleeping through the night during most of the time I was writing my thesis; when you sleep, your mom and I sleep, too. Thank you for your smiles, as well, they brighten my day.

Finally, I would like to express a very special thank you to my wife, Brenda. Your love, support and assistance has been critical to my success. Thank you for transcribing my interviews, for proofreading chapters again and again, and for listening as I went on and on about my research. [You were listening, right?] Thank you for looking after me, for being there when I needed you, and for making me happy.

Table of Contents

Chapter One - Introduction **1**

Defining Citizenship 2

Citizenship, Nation-State and Post-Nation-State 4

Possession and Practice 5

Coming to the Question 7

The Question 10

The Study 11

Finding Space for the Study 12

Situating Myself within the Study 13

Expectations for the Study 15

Chapter Two – Reviewing the Literature **17**

The Contentiousness of Citizenship 17

Is there a Crisis in Citizenship Education? 20

Schools and Citizenship 21

The Amorphous Nature of Citizenship 22

Giving Citizenship Shape and Substance 26

Amorphous Citizenship Education in English Canada 34

Conventional Models of Citizenship are no Longer Suitable 40

Permeable Boundaries: Frontiers and Good Citizenship 42

Less Conventional Citizenship 46

(Good) Citizenship as the Goal of Public Education 48

Social Studies and Citizenship 52

Citizenship Education beyond the Boundaries of Social Studies 55

Diversity and Education for (Good) Citizenship 56

What Does this Mean for Educators? 59

Chapter Three – Methodology 61

Focus of the Study 61

The Research Question 62

Choosing a Research Approach 62

Research Method 64

Drawing the Sample 65

Conducting the Interviews 67

Engaging in Analysis 68

Ethical Considerations 71

Verification 72

The Interview Questions 73

Chapter Four – Interviews and Analysis 82

Citizenship Education and Curriculum 82

Teaching, Community and Practice 94

Shaping of Citizenship 95

Citizenship and Subject Area 99

Democratic Classrooms 107

Citizenship Education and Reflective Practice 110

Teachers as Citizenship Educators 112

Chapter Five – Insights and Possibilities **114**

Differences and Reconciliation 118

Encountering Resistance 120

Recognizing Potential 121

Reconciling Findings and Expectations 121

What Next? 123

References **126**

Appendix A – Information Letter **132**

Appendix B – Interviewee Consent Form **133**

Appendix C – Interview Questions **134**

Chapter 1

Introduction

One of the motivating factors behind my choice to become a teacher was an interest in how to foster a greater understanding and appreciation of the nature and practice of citizenship. I believe that public education plays an essential role in helping students to shape, develop and practice good citizenship. Schools share this responsibility to cultivate good citizenship among young people with the family, religious and cultural institutions, the media, and peer groups; these all play important roles in establishing the trajectory of young people's sense of citizenship. Teachers, school administrators, curriculum designers, academics, and policy makers all act in some manner through overt and hidden curricular frameworks and through the priorities of public education, to cultivate suitable climates for the development and growth of good citizenship in classrooms, on school campuses, and in the communities in which these institutions are situated.

Although the terms citizenship and good citizenship are used liberally in curriculum documents and scholarly literature, especially in social studies related disciplines, one should not assume that these terms themselves possess universal meaning. Variations between definitions in mainstream references as well as diverse and sometimes contrasting conceptions of the meaning and nature of citizenship in the academic literature suggest that it may not be wise to make assumptions concerning what constitutes the nature and practice of citizenship education or how it is practiced from classroom to classroom.

Defining Citizenship

Dictionary definitions of citizenship are not difficult to find, but they offer a very constrained and rigid conception of the notion of citizen and citizenship. The Oxford English Dictionary (OED) defines citizenship as "[t]he position or status of being a citizen, with its rights and privileges"(1989). According to the OED, a citizen is an inhabitant of a city or town, and is likely to posses civic rights and privileges. It further adds that a citizen may be a "member of a state, an enfranchised inhabitant of a country, as opposed to an alien; in *U.S.*, a person, native or naturalized, who has the privilege of voting for public offices, and is entitled to full protection in the exercise of private rights" (1989). The Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary defines citizenship as "**1 :** the status of being a citizen **2 a :** membership in a community (as a college) **b :** the quality of an individual's response to membership in a community" (2005). Although there is a general concurrence in these definitions of citizen and citizenship, the differences in these mainstream references reveal a glimpse of the contested nature of citizenship, a concept that is central to our identities. One of the characteristics of citizenship that is revealed in the OED definition, and apparent in the spelling of citizen and citizenship, is its etymological root in the Latin *civitatum*, the city. Until three or four centuries ago this connection to the city as the site of citizenship was closely associated with city-state centered republics in Europe, and, more historically, with Roman citizenship, especially in the era of the Republic.

The modern sense of citizenship is tied to the 17th Century notion of nation-state with defined boundaries, a concept generally associated with the Treaty of Westphalia,

1648, and to the Enlightenment ideals of the 18th Century concerning natural rights of man and the extension of rights and privileges to increasingly affluent middle classes. This conception of citizenship provides a social contract framework for the relationship between state and person based on consent and reciprocity. Yet the relationship between state and person is not perfectly balanced. The primacy of one party to the social contract relative to the other tips the balance between conservative and liberal conceptions of citizenship. In The History of the Concept of Citizenship, Derek Heater provides five conceptions of citizenship that reflect different balances of primacy between state and individual (1992). Classical citizenship asks the citizen to place public good ahead of private interest. Liberal citizenship emphasizes the primacy of private interest; the degree to which a citizen served the interest of the community was up to the discretion of that citizen. Social citizenship places the burden on the state to look out for the interest and social security of the citizen to ensure that there are no economic impediments to serving the community. National citizenship demands the citizen serve the interest of the state. Lastly, multiple citizenships, where they are recognized, allow citizens to concurrently possess citizenship in more than one nation-state. Ken Osborne writes that citizenship defines who is included in a particular community, and who is excluded; he notes that there are potential risks to individuals and communities presented by situations where citizenship is not recognized, or it is withdrawn (1997). Citizenship generally defines who we are, and how we relate to the place(s) we legally belong. To not possess any citizenship is to be stateless; it is to fall through the cracks of modernity.

Citizenship, Nation-State and Post-Nation-State

The nature of modern citizenship is not static. Tied to forces such as the evolution of communication and other technologies, information management, human conflict and cooperation, new and old alliances, nationalisms and changing patterns of immigration, consumerism and consumption of resources, the citizen/state relationship in the nation-states of the Western world is significantly different than what had been envisioned by those state's founders. Old narratives are being revised, amended and transformed to reflect realities of diversity as well as demographic, technological, and ideological change.

Globalization and technological innovation have had a significant impact on the relationships between the nation-states and their citizens. National memberships in supranational and transnational organizations are accompanied by requirements and expectations to adhere to treaty obligations (Rizvi, 2003, 2004). When considered in combination with development of ever more sophisticated communication technologies, complex trade networks and other globalizing practices, trade in goods and services stretch beyond national boundaries far more often than they did a few decades ago and encounter fewer impediments than in the past. According to Castells, the new global economy has evolved significantly from the world economy that preceded it. "[The global economy] is an economy with the capacity to work as a unit in real time, on a planetary scale" (2000, pg. 259). The instantaneousness of communication, especially across great distances, and the practices of out-sourcing and just-in-time delivery act to compress time and space (Held, McGrew, Goldblatt, & Perraton, 2000). Such forces diminish the power of states to exercise sovereignty in their traditional domains. In

addition, personal connections to the nation-state are becoming progressively less relevant with ever-increasing numbers of people whose attachment to a corporate entity trumps their national identity. Terry Carson writes "[t]he new economy and global competition for jobs and markets mean that one should not count on setting down roots anywhere. Can such a person be anything more that just nominally a citizen of the place where they happen to reside for the time being, a place in which they have only the most tenuous of attachments to the larger collectivity?" (2006, pg. 26-27).

Globalization and the global economy are just one dimension of the changing nature and relevance of the modern nation-state, and the issue of what it means to practice good citizenship. Martha Nussbaum (1996) for example, in advocating cosmopolitanism, argues that national boundaries are arbitrary and act as an impediment to social justice. Still others draw attention to the potential to address social justice and conflict issues if the concept of the practice of good citizenship were more regularly extended beyond national boundaries (Ladson-Billings, 2005; Noddings, 2005; Osler & Starkey, 2005).

Possession and Practice

When is citizenship a possession and when is it a practice? Are they complimentary and concurrent, or, can citizenship as a practice operate independently of citizenship as a possession? When individuals look out for the interests of their own community itself or for members of another community in need, it could be said that such an effort reflects the ideal of what is called *good citizenship*. In fact, there is seldom any impediment barring non-citizens from practicing such a form of *good citizenship*. Yet,

by themselves, are such acts of *good citizenship*, something apart from the practice of good national citizenship?

Heater writes "Citizenship is a matter not just of status, rights and duties legally defined, but also of commitment, loyalty and responsibility – of being a *good citizen*" (2004, pg. 195). What does it mean, then, to be a *good citizen*? In any modern democratic state the balance of obligation towards citizen or towards state reflects the dominant ideology of a particular community. This in turn is reflected in a range of domains including educational policy and curriculum design. Yet, the implementation of policy and curriculum of a concept such as citizenship may be made based on narrowly defined and perhaps universalistic assumptions about what it means to possess and practice citizenship. Should policy-makers and curriculum designers reasonably expect teachers to articulate such an important concept in a consistent and complementary manner?

In Canada, implementation of educational policy and curriculum faces a range of complicating and confounding factors. The demographic profile of Canada has changed significantly in the last few decades, reflecting changing immigration patterns that have yielded a significant increase of immigrants from Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, and from Central, Eastern and Southern Asia. This has been accompanied by a corresponding decrease of immigrants from Europe, especially Western Europe. In addition, Canada has numerous competing historical narratives that shape conceptions of the nature of the country, and the question of which historical narrative is dominant is dependent on the province, region and ideological considerations. Further, there has been an increasing awareness of the indigenous nations and communities in Canada. This

awareness is accompanied by demographic changes that have resulted in increasing movement of aboriginal populations to urban centres, growing recognition of past injustices, and recognition of economic, social, cultural, and other assimilative pressures that have long acted to erase or obscure distinct identities. Canada is also a country where education is constitutionally a closely guarded policy domain of the provinces, making it especially challenging or perhaps impossible to find any national consensus on what it means to teach and practice good Canadian citizenship.

Coming to the Question

Teachers, regardless of their discipline, along with their students are engaged with a curriculum that has as its goal, whether stated or implied, the shaping and crafting of good citizens. What we do not know is whether teachers as education practitioners, charged with the responsibility of preparing their students for good citizenship, are conscious of what that citizenship education entails or has the potential to entail. What seems like a straight-forward and altruistic objective, is becoming much more complex in an increasingly diverse liberal democratic nation-state situated in a tension-filled globalizing world.

Formal curricula in diverse Western liberal democratic nation-states are generally constructed around Western notions and assumptions of knowledge and education. Are teachers well acquainted with the assimilative notions associated with hegemonic conceptions of language, history, politics, culture, and within disciplines such as mathematics and the sciences? Are these teachers aware of the risks posed by these assumptions on the culturally constructed knowledge frameworks of students who come from non-Western communities? What are the risks of marginalizing these students and

other members of the community who exhibit too much *otherness*? James Banks (2004) suggests that hegemonic discourses and the assimilationist approaches common to Western education tend to leave these students alienated from their own communities and from the larger community. While engaging in such deeply embedded processes of assimilation, teachers may be unaware that they are alienating these students through subtle but institutionalized racism.

Matters of citizenship education have been further complicated by national security discourses, especially in light of the events of September 11, 2001 and of subsequent large-scale terror events that have elevated suspicion within our own communities, and have resulted in the allocation of funds to security and military concerns at the expense of social justice issues (Giroux, 2005; Rizvi, 2003, 2004; Smith, 2003). In the immediate aftermath of any such event, or in the wake of conflicts half-a-world away, distant events have the potential to touch and impact the lives of students who may be otherwise less world-aware; consequently, they become more conscious of notions of place and the safety and security of their own well-being. Students struggle with the nature of their own identities relative to others in their immediate context, and many are seldom even conscious of or curious about events at levels beyond those immediate contexts that influence or impact their own behaviour; students need to be exposed to teachers who can guide them to more actively engage the world and help shape current and future discourses on citizenship.

Teachers in Canada and in liberal democratic nation-states around the world face growing challenges in helping students shape and sculpt their own identities, while at the same time helping students to integrate into the diverse communities to which they

belong. For the last few decades in Alberta, and throughout Canada, citizenship education has been taking a backseat to other more privileged subject areas and disciplines (Osborne, 1997, 2001, 2005; Sears, Clarke, & Hughes, 1999). Osborne writes that citizenship education is making a comeback, although it is *ghettoized* within history and social studies disciplines, "leaving teachers of other subjects to concentrate on more 'academic' priorities" (2005, pg. 14). There are, however, growing calls in academic circles to broaden the scope of citizenship education beyond the realm of history and social studies disciplines, and encourage teachers in other disciplines to appreciate that each of them plays an integral role in citizenship education.

If the perception of the burden of teaching citizenship education is broadened to include disciplines and subject areas beyond history and social studies, it would be very helpful to have a sense of the nature, relevance, importance, implications and applications of citizenship education inside classrooms in those other disciplines, as well as a deeper appreciation of the role citizenship education plays in the school environment. In addition, it would be useful to develop a sense of how well teachers in all disciplines are prepared to address a curriculum where citizenship education outcomes are more deeply integrated.

Schools are a sea of overt and hidden messages with significant potential to shape students identities and influence their relationship with their peers and their communities. Citizenship related messages exist overtly and covertly in various media in the schools including textbooks, library materials, audio and video, visual and digital. Further messages relating to citizenship exist in the culture of the school, through rules, attitudes, morale, and socio-economic climate. The hidden curriculum plays an important role in

influencing citizenship behaviours and attitudes, by, for example, school policies that are implemented without much consideration about how they impact students' attitudes towards citizenship and their perception of authority (Osborne, 1997, 2001, 2005).

Overt citizenship education is not alien to disciplines other than social studies. In mathematics, essential skills such as numeracy and the ability to understand statistics are important elements of citizenship education. Further, cultivating a climate of cooperation, making students' responsibility for contribution to lessons and discouraging the view that mathematics is all about the right answer, are all elements of sound and relevant citizenship pedagogy (Noddings, 2005; Simmt, 2001). In English language arts, teachers are taking advantage of opportunities to move beyond the canon of Western literature, opening a world of other voices; voices that emanate from sources that are not white, middle-class and male (Johnston, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 2005). Language arts classrooms, according to Johnston , are now sites where " new discourses question the 'taken-for-granted' of the past and create spaces for new bodies of knowledge and social relationships alongside old, traditional and familiar" (2001).

The Question

How do teachers understand the notion of citizenship, and how does their understanding of this notion impact their personal perception of their practice? Teachers are the frontline agents of the public education system's endeavour to deliver and shape students' conceptions of citizenship. Therefore, it would be beneficial to understand how teachers, regardless of their specific discipline or subject area, understand the notion of citizenship, and reflect and appreciate how that understanding impacts teachers' personal perceptions of their own teaching practice.

It is safe to assume that no two teachers will have the same teaching experience, life experience or background. Further, each teacher's pedagogic approach to address the content and curriculum in his or her subject area is to some extent unique. If their approaches are unique and their experiences are unique we should assume that their understanding of the notion of citizenship is also unique. With consideration to the centrality of good citizenship as the expected outcome of public education, the complex and dynamic nature of citizenship itself, especially in a diverse liberal democratic world and within the global and globalizing community, are teachers giving sufficient conscious thought to the nature and shape of citizenship education within their own practice? Do teachers feel adequately prepared to think of their subject area as both a venue and a framework for citizenship education? And, are teachers able to appreciate the potential they possess, individually and collectively, to redefine and expand on a concept so central to personal and community identities?

The Study

This study offers the opportunity to gain some insight into the perspectives of six high school teachers in one public high school in a major urban centre in Alberta on what each participant believes is the nature of citizenship, and how each believes it shapes or influences their professional practice. Each participant sat for a one-on-one semi-structured interview, approximately one hour in length, during the first three weeks of November 2005. The data they provided was a snapshot of their own understandings, at that point in time, of what it means to teach for good citizenship.

Finding Space for this Study

There is a limited amount of literature that speaks specifically to teachers' individual conceptions of the notion of citizenship, and to the question of how teaching for good citizenship fits into their own practice, especially in the Canadian context. What literature there is focuses largely on social studies related disciplines. As an example, in 2005, Jeffrey Fouts and W.O. Lee produced Education for Social Citizenship: Perceptions of Teachers in the USA, Australia, England, Russia and China. This mixed method study found some shared emphasis on fostering social awareness as a central aspect of the practice of good citizenship among participants in all five settings. However, significant dissimilarities about conceptions of citizenship emerged, as well. For example, the relationship of the concept of patriotism relative to good citizenship reveals a significant contrast among teachers in participant communities in this study. "Patriotism is strongly emphasized by the Russian and Guangzhou teachers as an important feature of citizenship…[h]owever, the Australian teachers are ambivalent towards patriotism, and the English teachers talk about community concerns rather than patriotism" (Lee, 2005, pg. 260). Studies carried out in other Western liberal democratic nation-states may have some resonance here in Canada, but the demographic, economic, cultural, social and political differences between these nation-states and Canada likely means that findings in such studies would be difficult to generalize to the Canadian case. The last major study of civics education in Canada, for instance, was A.B. Hodgetts study in 1968, although it too focused on social studies classrooms (Shields & Ramsay, 2004).

I am quite interested in the data gathered from participant-teachers who teach in mathematics and the sciences. In recent years, the science and mathematics domains

have been more privileged than other disciplines; research, development and application of science an mathematics in science and technology related occupations and industries have the potential for varying degrees of benefit and harm to the various levels of communities we live in, from local to global. Reconceptualizing and expanding the role of citizenship education means emphasizing the importance of appreciating community morals and values, and engaging in ethical decision making on issues that have impact on humanity and global ecosystems (Olson & Lang, 2004; Richardson & Blades, 2001; Richardson, Blades, Kumano, & Karaki, 2003). Nel Noddings (2005) emphasizes the role that teachers in science and mathematics can play in promoting peace and ecological issues within the frameworks of their disciplines. "Every conscientious science teacher dedicated to peace should plan to go outside his or her discipline to find material that is relevant to both science and peace education" (pg. 20).

Situating Myself within this Study

I recognize that my own understanding of the nature of citizenship and the nature and purposes of citizenship education are continually subject to change and revision reflecting changes I perceive, both consciously and subconsciously, in the world around me, my exposure to citizenship education discourses in scholarly literature and course work, through reflection on my own professional practice, and my brief experience, so far, as a teacher-educator. Further, I appreciate that my perception of citizenship and its role within education plays a critical role in shaping the nature of this study, the questions I ask of the teacher-participants, and further, I realize that my perceptions act as the filter through which I will analyse the data, and through which I will draw my conclusions.

I still see a deep and necessary connection between citizenship and nation-states while recognizing that the nature of attachment to such polities is becoming much more tenuous for a growing number of people whose association with and loyalty to traditional nation-state entities is weaker than attachments to transnational corporate entities (Carson, 2006). Nation-states still have an infrastructure and mechanisms for social justice that do not exist at the supranational level; also nation-states often have systems of accountability, especially in liberal democratic states, and such infrastructure, mechanisms and systems seldom have supranational and transnational counterparts, especially amongst corporate entities. Yet I also see the potential for recognizing that calls for a broader understanding of citizenship within the context of citizenship education that stretch its potential beyond the conventional boundaries of nation-states, and recognize the complexity and interconnectedness of humanity, human communities, and the environment in which all of these are situated (Ladson-Billings, 2005; Noddings, 2005; Nussbaum, 1996; Osler & Starkey, 2005).

I believe that teachers need to be well prepared to help their students appreciate that the world in which they live is complex, and stretches beyond the immediate and the local, and should involve a degree of care and consideration that extends inquiry into understanding and dialogue into action, and restrains nationalisms, racisms, and other hegemonic discourses and particularisms that constrain and limit the extension of dignities and freedoms to all human beings. Yet, coping with all of this complexity, as well as integrating and balancing citizenship education within the context of programs of study and the curriculum in general is a challenging task. The challenge for teachers is to develop deeper understandings of the disciplines and subject areas in which each of them

teaches, and this is further complicated by the dynamic nature of teaching assignments, changes in curriculum, accesses to resources and support, accommodation of the needs and capabilities of each of their students, as well as the expectations of administrators, school boards, parents, and the communities where they are situated.

Expectations for the Study

The amorphousness of citizenship within the context of citizenship education means that it possesses a *catch-all* nature that confounds the discourse and allows teaching practitioners the flexibility to find ground where each can seem comfortably situated while being aware, to varying degrees, that the ground and whole landscape of citizenship is shifting around and beneath each of them. Is citizenship, then, an empty signifier representing whatever teachers, administrators, scholars, teacher educators and policy makers personally feel is most representative of its intended nature within the curriculum, and most compatible with personal ideological orientation? Does it mean just about anything, or are there common threads that run through teachers' conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education regardless of discipline or subject specialization?

Public education has to serve a range of ends that may not always be compatible or concurrent with the idealistic and altruistic outcomes we may desire. If public education is supposed to be a public good, it no longer seems to serve that purpose. Instead, policy makers employ it in an instrumentalist fashion, placing global competitiveness among its highest priorities. Current funding regimes and high-stakes testing tend to encourage the commodification of education. The challenge for teachers is to conceive of citizenship education as more broadly based than it has been treated in the past.

I suspect that many teachers in all subject areas and disciplines may not give much conscious consideration to their role as teachers and models of good citizenship. I believe that in encouraging teachers to give more conscious attention to their role as citizenship educators, and helping them consider the program of studies in their discipline or subject area as a framework of opportunities for constructive citizenship education, they can be encouraged to recognize their collective potential to expand the domain of what it means to practice good citizenship, and the potential to redefine the concept within their community and in the community at large.

Additionally, I expect that while participants in this study may offer conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education that have an action dimension and encourage students to develop consciousness of diversity, engage in intercultural awareness and foster an appreciation for issues that confront humanity and the environment, I do not expect that most of teacher-participants will have ever deeply reflected on the nature of citizenship education itself, or on the challenges to conventional and traditional citizenship and citizenship education discourses posed by globalizing factors that continue to erode national sovereignty, and transform the domains such as education, health, agriculture, manufacturing, communication, trade and services on a world-wide scale. Yet it is just such reflective practice that I personally believe needs to take place amongst pre-service and in-service teachers in order to foster opportunities to be better acquainted with the complexity and confounding nature of both citizenship and citizenship education.

Chapter 2

Reviewing the Literature

The Contentiousness of Citizenship

The amount of literature related to the theory or notion of citizenship and its relationship to education is staggeringly vast. The more I have read on the subject, the more challenging it is to attempt to define citizenship or in any sense delimit its boundaries or nature. In the context of education, the concept of citizenship is both vague and dynamic, allowing scholars, theorists, curriculum specialists, and educators of all sorts, the opportunity to engage in defining citizenship for themselves and their audiences; but, its amorphous nature means that no one seems to have been able to capture its essence; each member of the audience, in turn, synthesizes his or her own understanding and definition.

Dozens of adjectives have been attached to citizenship to reflect particular conceptions, visions, aspects, dispositions and understandings, and it has been subjected to substantial amounts of categorization and parsing. The notion of citizenship has been stretched across continuum after continuum, with some scholars and theorists offering very complex, multidimensional models. Others have offered visions of citizenship that are concentric, with varying degrees of intensity of relationship between individual and community as one moves from center to periphery. Still others offer models that consist of complex webs that connect individuals and groups into vast new post-modern communities. The flexibility of the notion of citizenship means that it can be described as universal and particularistic at the same time; simultaneously inclusive and exclusive, liberating and constrictive.

Theories of citizenship speak of relationships between individuals and community, and how that relationship shapes and reflects individual and community identity. Yet the type of community, the makeup of its membership, and how it is constituted is integral in the nature, purpose, and expectations associated with citizenship. Kymlicka and Norman write that "the scope of a 'theory of citizenship' is potentially limitless--almost every problem in political philosophy involves relations among citizens or between citizens and the state" (1994, pg. 353). Further, they argue that many citizenship theorists conflate two aspects of citizenship: 'Citizenship-as-legal-status' and 'citizenship-as-desirable-activity'. In my own reading of the literature I have found that too often this distinction seems lost, forgotten, or ignored. The conflation of the two can result in a failure to differentiate expectations, responsibilities and duties to the state that are *de jure* obligations, against those expectations, responsibilities and duties one feels are obligations reflecting their sense of belonging or attachment to a community, regardless of whether the community is local, regional, national or global. These two aspects of citizenship are, though, not mutually exclusive; they are in fact complementary, which contributes to the confusion and to the problem of conflation. Yet even with such a distinction between legal status and desirable activity in mind, the nature of citizenship remains very much unclear.

Some degree of clarity is certainly helpful in the discussion of the nature of citizenship, because it is a notion that is both currently and historically central to the purposes of public and common education. This is especially the case in liberal democracies, although virtually all highly organized political systems, especially those that enforce extreme limits on individual autonomy, give significant attention to civic

socialization through education. In fact, citizenship education, consisting of civic socialization and the cultivation of what may be called 'good citizenship,' may be considered the *raison d'être* of organized public education (Sears & Hughes, 1996). Schools are important sites of citizenship education as well as teaching for good citizenship. Schools, however, are not exclusively the only sites where this socialization process takes place. Citizenship education takes place, as well, in the home and through other cultural and religious venues and institutions, and the messages concerning citizenship and good citizenship conveyed by these institutions to young people may deviate from or contradict the liberal democratic values that, at least in theory, are acquired through overt and hidden curricula in the school (Callan, 1997; Strike, 1998).

Educating youth for good citizenship certainly seems to be an important enterprise for liberal democratic societies. Young people in early 21st century Canada are becoming increasingly aware of their diverse nation-state community; a community whose diversity comes from a combination of immigration from all regions of the world, from increasing recognition of existing diversity within Canada's national boundaries, and from the recognition of aspects of identity and community that were historically displaced or ignored through the influence of powerful dominant discourses and myopic historical narratives. Young people in Canada have access to a range of media, products and services that permit opportunities to access and enjoy a level of awareness and interconnectedness with other individuals and communities in virtually every region of the world. Concurrently, their nation-state exists within complex networks of interconnectedness and interdependence with other nation-states and it enjoys membership in a variety of transnational and supranational organizations and entities.

Yet articulating a shared sense of citizenship amongst Canadians, especially what role education plays in cultivating responsible citizenship, forces theorists, scholars, educators and policy makers to reflect on the complexities and diverse opinions about the nature and constitution of community itself. They must consider competing conceptions of Canadian identity, and consider and contend with forces, both external and internal, that shape the conceptions and approaches to citizenship education in the present, and may determine the trajectory of citizenship education theory and practice in the future.

Is There a Crisis in Citizenship Education?

Since the early 1990s, the amount of academic literature devoted to the question of citizenship has been on the increase. Reflection on the nature of citizenship, and the role and nature of citizenship education has coincided with increasing globalization, immigration, and significant changes in information and communication technologies, as well as increasing awareness of diversity and disparity that exists within and beyond the boundaries of modern liberal democratic nation-states. This is compounded with a perception, in both the popular media and in some scholarly literature that political apathy, ignorance, alienation and cynicism are on the rise in liberal democracies, especially among young people, and that schools and other social and community institutions that are tasked with educating for good citizenship, are failing to instill the appropriate values and behaviors associated with good citizenship. Yet, according to Sears and Hyslop-Margison, youth are no more or less ignorant or apathetic than they were a generation ago (2006).

Is *crisis*, then, the appropriate word to describe the challenges of teaching for good citizenship faced by citizenship education theorists, practitioners and policy

makers? The problems have likely been with us for a very long time, and different dimensions of the problem are illuminated in the light of other issues and crises that arise, and pushed into the public view by the tension between new voices making themselves heard and deeply entrenched voices trying to reassert their perspective and maintain their historically dominant position.

Schools and Citizenship

Most citizenship education scholars agree that schools play an important and critical role in teaching for good citizenship, along with other sites of citizenship education such as the family, and other religious and cultural institutions. According to Sears and Hyslop-Margison (2006), it is ironic that schools are considered ideal sites for citizenship education in liberal democracies, since they are seldom particularly democratic institutions for either teachers or students. According to Osborne, "often schools depoliticize the concept [of citizenship], equating good citizen with good person" (2001, pg. 34). Yet, based on the nature of all the academic literature and even on the writing and rhetoric in the popular media, citizenship is certainly and inescapably political. It is "inextricably connected with questions and governments and social living, of identity, of equity and justice, especially in any society which aspires to be democratic, where citizens have a voice in deciding the shape of their society and how they are governed, where, ideally, they govern themselves" (pg. 17).

The political nature of citizenship education fosters a certain degree of discomfort among teachers and administrators. According to Sears and Hyslop-Margison (2006) teachers avoid controversial topics and school administrators are resistant to critiques of policies and to expressions of democratic practices especially by students. The discourse

on citizenship education is highly contingent on theoretical and ideological perspectives. This means that depending on the theoretical and ideological lens employed by theorists, policymakers, and educators, the purpose and possibilities of citizenship education can be conceived of in a range of ways. Voices on the left may regard citizenship education as an opportunity to help students develop a capacity for facilitating structural change in their own communities and beyond, and engage in constructive and transformative social critique. Voices on the right may stress a more conservative agenda, focusing attention on the development of good character as the central nature of good citizenship (Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).

Schools function as the key public domain venue for citizenship education for young people. Because of citizenship education's political nature and the school's potential to craft and shape students' conception of community, identity and responsibility, teachers, scholars and curriculum developers need to recognize and take better advantage of their position to define good citizenship for their communities. Teachers need a sufficient degree of latitude in their classroom practice to help students develop positive attitudes and broader perspectives about what it means to practice good citizenship. But, classroom teachers need to have a good foundation in what it means to be a teacher of good citizenship; the challenge for classroom teachers in this regard is reflecting on the nature of citizenship itself, what it means to each teacher personally, and what role citizenship education plays in his or her teaching practice.

The Amorphous Nature of Citizenship

The contested nature of citizenship makes it an exceptionally difficult term to define. Citizenship, itself, could be described as a shared sense of membership in a single

political community, although it may be possible for any individual to possess citizenship in more than one political community. These memberships are central to an individual's identity. Citizenship as an identity is linked to a particular community and is shared with other members of that community through shared culture and/or a shared commitment to core liberal principles of equality, freedom, tolerance, and constitutionalism (Williams, 2003). According to Williams, those shared values are fundamental to any liberal democratic community, especially diverse communities, in order to overcome 'darker aspects of nationalism' that act is binding agents in communities with powerful, dominant, hegemonic groups.

Conventionally, especially since the Treaty of Westphalia in 1648, citizenship has been directly associated with nation states. Derek Heater calls citizenship a purely legal concept, describing it as a combination of political and legal status reflecting Enlightenment ideals of reciprocal obligations of the social contract nature between the individual and a sovereign nation state (Heater, 2004). He further defines citizenship as "a matter not just a status, rights then duties legally defined, but also of commitment, loyalty and responsibility--of being *a good citizen*" (pg. 195). According to Williams, conventionally, national territorial boundaries have been essential to define and delimit the demos in a nation-state. Thus, even in diverse liberal democratic communities where ties to communities are based more deeply, in theory, on shared values than on shared national identity, liberal democracy still borrows a key mechanism from nationalism, employing place of birth as a means of maintaining their demos. The implication, paradoxically, in liberal democracies, where choice and consent are fundamental

freedoms, membership in the demos, for many, is not necessarily a product of choice or consent.

Williams refers to Yael Tamir's argument that liberal democracy and nationalism share more than citizenship by birth. "It will not suffice, for liberal democracy, that individuals merely affirmed the validity of core liberal principles. In addition, it is important that they feel an *affective attachment* to those principles, to the citizens who share them, and the regime that embodies them. In short, it is important that they have some sense of *loyalty* to the principles, to fellow citizens, and to the constitutional order that connects them" (2003, pg. 211). This affective attachment to liberal principles is meant to fulfill two broad liberal ends: distributive justice and a strong attachment to the political institutional regime to maintain political stability. In conventional, nation-state conceptions of citizenship, clearly defined political boundaries and a stable regime are necessary for distributive justice, especially when it comes to the allocation of benefits within a welfare state.

However, the discourse on citizenship education and on citizenship theory itself is not necessarily tied to Enlightenment conventions of bounded nation-states. Many theorists and educators strongly believe that citizenship education and education for good citizenship means teaching students to think and act beyond the boundaries and constraints of their nation-state communities. Many philosophers and educational theorists have engaged the topics of cosmopolitanism and world citizenship as critical domains for the future of citizenship education. There are a significant range of opinions and perspectives on the role that cosmopolitanism and global (or world) citizenship should play in curricula. Philosophers such as Martha Nussbaum believe that

cosmopolitanism and teaching for global citizenship offer a means for practicing social justice and overcoming patriotism, which she views as both 'easy sentiment' and morally dangerous (1996). Others, such as Nel Noddings, write that educating for global citizenship increases ecological awareness and promotes peace (2005). Still other educational scholars offer global citizenship education as ontology; an avenue to foster interconnectedness among diverse communities around the world, to share their perspectives on global issues and matters of social justice, and to develop and engage in actions, collectively, to help address these issues of mutual concern (Osler & Starkey, 2005; Richardson & Blades, 2006; Richardson *et al.*, 2003).

Beyond its spatial flexibility and seeming amorphousness, citizenship also has a temporal aspect. According to Hans Smits (2006), citizenship education cannot simply be understood as a preparation for the future nor simply captured in the present. Students must learn that the actions they might take in their practice of citizenship should not simply be a reaction to the immediate, but they need to be understood as embedded in time. Every moment is interwoven and interconnected with others in the continuum from the past to the future. Like Smits, David G. Smith argues that any discussion on citizenship and citizenship education is also temporally situated. This is because students need to develop a consciousness that nation-states and empires are also situated similarly in time within the stream of human existence. Using Smith's Comparative Discourse of Empire, students learn to see *Europe/America* as only the latest episode of empire within the world's long historical experience and not the culmination of a Western teleological narrative (2006).

Giving Citizenship Shape and Substance

In 1964, Justice Potter Stewart experienced difficulty putting his conception of pornography and obscenity into words. However, he expressed with certainty, "but I know it when I see it" (U.S. Supreme Court, 1964). Although citizenship evades easy description, if it does have a specific shape and substance, political and educational theorists cannot agree fully what it is. Unlike Justice Potter's difficulty with being able to verbally articulate the nature of pornography in *Jacobellis v. Ohio*, which like citizenship is both a value-laden term and contentious concept, many political and educational scholars, and theorists have expressed, with varying degrees of confidence, that the nature of citizenship can be clearly expressed.

Adding to the challenge of capturing the nature of citizenship, though, is recognizing that the notion of citizenship is, itself, a social construct, and according to Fouts and Lee, its meaning varies from one cultural and linguistic context to another (2005). They write that citizenship, as a practice, is a product of enculturation, socialization and education. They argue that Western, liberal conceptions of citizenship are often difficult to translate well into non-western cultural contexts and settings. For example, the concepts of *private*, *privacy* and *individualism*, all central to Western liberal conceptions of citizenship, have negative connotations in Chinese culture.

The range of attempts to clearly define the nature of citizenship has been further subject to the Marxist critique that the whole notion of citizenship itself, and the practice of citizenship education, regardless of attempts to make it more inclusive, reinforces the status quo, and allows elites to maintain their position of privilege. Virtually all models and conceptions of citizenship offer the opportunity for participation in the community

and in the political arena, but virtually all of them implicitly acknowledge that the need for new models or approaches to encourage broader participation, reflecting the reality that, otherwise, economically dominant elites would continue to dominate political access and process.

Significant amounts of scholarship with regards to citizenship have occurred since the end of World War II. This has resulted in numerous models and conceptions of modern citizenship; almost all of these models and conceptions are multidimensional or can be situated on some sort of continuum. In certain respects, most treat citizenship or *good* citizenship as both ontology and desirable practice; although what it means to practice good citizenship can vary considerably. Amongst the earliest of postwar scholarship of importance on the subject was that of T.H. Marshall. He argued that citizenship consisted of three elements: civil, political and social (1973). Civil citizenship reflects basic liberal ideals: liberties and rights of the person, including liberties of thought, faith, and property, and the right of access to justice. Political citizenship means the opportunity not only to practice the franchise as an elector, but the opportunity for a citizen to seek elected office, as well. The social element of citizenship is the most progressive; citizens are entitled to economic assistance to ensure their opportunity to practice the other elements of citizenship is not inhibited. Marshall's elements of citizenship have certainly been subject of critique. Will Kymlicka and Wayne Norman (1994), for example, write that Marshall's sense of citizenship, particularly civil citizenship is private and passive, that is, the absence of an obligation to participate in the political community. They do, however, offer some support for Marshall against the neo-liberal criticism that reliance on economic support from the state

fosters passivity and a culture of dependence. Kymlicka and Norman argue that there in no evidence to suggest that the cuts to welfare programs have encouraged increased participation of under classes. In addition, Kymlicka (1995) wrote that Marshall's conception of citizenship does little to accommodate differences in a diverse society. Kymlicka argues that conventional Western liberal notions of citizenship, which function as the foundation of Marshall's model, are assimilationist, systematically ignoring minority voices.

Will Kymlicka (1995), too, has contributed significantly to the discourse relating to making citizenship more accommodating to multicultural and multinational communities within the boundaries of a single nation-state, offering the concept of differentiated citizenship. The intention of differentiated citizenship is to find means to accommodate differences while retaining liberal egalitarian values and individual autonomy. At its most basic, differentiated citizenship extends citizenship beyond the conventional relationship between individual and nation-state, and offers avenues for the exercise of rights through membership in national or cultural groups.

Differentiated citizenship can be broken down into three sets of rights: special representation rights in response to conditions of oppression, self-government rights for national minorities, and multicultural rights to remedy disadvantages to particular cultural, linguistic or other groups. Critics of differentiated citizenship rights suggest that multicultural rights inhibit integration of immigrant communities, special representation rights need to be contingent on some sort of mechanism to determine the merit of the claim to special consideration, and self-government rights reflect a desire to undermine or

otherwise seriously weaken the bonds that hold the larger community together (Kymlicka & Norman, 1994).

Derek Heater has also published a significant amount of literature on citizenship theory, history and education. In The History of the Concept of Citizenship, he offers five different conceptions of citizenship that can be situated on a continuum from exclusive to inclusive: classical, liberal, social, national, and multiple (1992). Classical citizenship is the most exclusive. Citizenship may be inherited or granted by the head of state. It is highly communitarian, placing the responsibility to act in the interest of the community ahead of serving private interests. This sense of citizenship still permeates modern, Western democracies, and forms the backbone of conservative and sometimes xenophobic understandings of the term. This approach to citizenship is highly dependent on forms of public-spiritedness.

Liberal citizenship provides, at its foundation, a set of rights that cannot be taken away, which place the interest of the individual ahead of the state, and allows a broadening of participation in civic life. Citizens are free to participate to the extent that they are interested, willing and capable to do so, or freely choose not to participate. In contrast to classical senses of citizenship, the obligation of citizens to serve the community is removed. The opportunity to place self interest ahead of communitarian interests offers a sharp contrast to the Heater's classical conception.

In social citizenship, Heater considers the question of whether wealth is a precondition of citizenship; this takes a neo-Marxist approach to ask the question of whether the purpose of citizenship is the maintenance of the status quo. Wealth means having a vested interest in social and civic mechanisms to protect that wealth. Further,

participation in the civic arena means having the time and other resources to be able to participate; thus egalitarian language of liberal citizenship ignores economic realities that those who must work longer hours, or survive on lesser means, have more limited access to the fruits of citizenship. Social citizenship is generally incompatible at the national level with the aims of free market systems, because of the need for the state to engage in social welfare action. Reflecting on Heater's and Marshall's conceptions of social citizenship, both suggest that social welfare mechanisms function in the interest of distributive justice, and act to level the playing field to allow any citizen from any economic stratum the opportunity to participate in the political community to whatever extent is desired.

Heater's national citizenship shapes the individual personality by associating them with a particular nation or polity. Like classical citizenship, national citizenship is communitarian in nature, yet the two are not entirely synonymous. This conception emphasizes national consciousness over that of the individual, and focuses on the pursuit of national goals. Nation-states construct national citizenship around symbols of various sorts, and institute rules that make it more exclusive than liberal or social senses of citizenship. In educational settings, significant amounts of citizenship education may be tied to indoctrination, or certainly to less critical approaches of appreciating the nature or impact of social, economic and cultural policies of national citizenship dominated regimes.

Heater's multiple citizenship offers some flexibility in community membership, allowing individuals to possess legal membership in more than one community, but also confronts challenges. Do incompatible allegiances exist? If so, which allegiances are the

most powerful? Although the idea of multiple citizenships is an ancient one, often applied by the Romans, for example, it has gained new currency in the guise of global citizenship, as a reaction to nationalist, racialist, and other centrifugal forces that act as means to separate and divide diverse communities. Heater, though, questions the extension of any sense of citizenship constituted around conceptions of citizenship normally associated with citizenship in a nation-state with those of global or world citizenship (1990, 1992, 2004). He writes that "[w]orld citizenship is nonsense; active world citizenship is nonsense on stilts" (1990, pg. 229).

Heater's theorizing about citizenship draws largely on historical foundations. There is, however, a vast amount of citizenship theory that is drawn from curricular and pedagogic sources. Two commonly cited examples include Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) three models of citizenship offered in social studies classrooms, as well as Kubow, Grossman and Ninomaya's multidimensional citizenship (1998).

Through their research on the practices of American social studies teachers, Westheimer and Kahne identified three general models of citizenship reflected in the pedagogical approaches employed by the teachers in their study: personally responsible citizenship, participatory citizenship, and justice oriented citizenship. The most conservative of these kinds of citizenship, and the one most commonly found in American social studies classrooms, is personally responsible citizenship. They describe the personally responsible citizen as acting "responsibly in his or her community by, for example, picking up litter, giving blood, obeying laws, and staying out of debt" (2004, pg. 241), and that education programs developed and implemented in classrooms, advocating this conception of citizenship, "attempt to build character and personal

responsibility by emphasizing honesty, integrity, self discipline, and hard work" (pg. 241).

Compared to the personally responsible citizen, the participatory citizen is involved in leading or organizing initiatives in their community and is involved actively within community and political organizations. Typically, the participatory citizen understands political structures and processes. Westheimer and Kahne's research showed, though, that the least likely approach to teaching for citizenship was that focused on the development of the justice oriented citizen. They describe justice oriented citizenship educators as believing that "effective democratic citizens need opportunities to analyze and understand the interplay of social, economic, and political forces" (pg. 242). Justice oriented educators work to implement

> education programs that emphasize social change [that] seek to prepare students to improve society by critically analyzing and addressing social issues and injustices. But less likely to emphasize the need for charity in volunteerism as ends in themselves and more likely to teach about social movements and how to effect systemic change (pg. 242).

There are other citizenship theory frameworks that treat the concept less conventionally, not as tightly bound to the relationship with nation-states. Multidimensional citizenship (Kubow et al., 1998), for example, offers a more holistic definition of citizenship; it has four dimensions: personal, social, spatial and temporal. This conception of citizenship is intended to more adequately address 21st century challenges. They write "…it will be increasingly important that citizens are able to approach problems as members of a global society. Citizenship understood as membership in an interconnected, global world challenges us to define ourselves in a much broader context, to expand our concept of citizen identity, as well as our local, state

and nation ones" (pg. 116). Their argument suggests, in contrast with that of Heater, that citizenship theory need not necessarily be constrained by historical boundaries that limit the conception of citizenship as solely the domain of the nation-state. Further, the conception of citizenship as multidimensional reflects both a dynamic relationship between its components as well as a synthesis of these same components, rather than offering binaries to describe what citizenship is or is not.

Within the personal dimension, multidimensional citizenship requires citizens to be active agents for social justice. The social dimension recognizes that citizenship is situated within a community, rather than engaged as a solitary practice. The spatial dimension recognizes that citizens must consider themselves as members of multiple and overlapping communities, from local through regional, national, and international; it also implies the recognition of increasing global interdependency, while still recognizing that individuals will continue to craft their identity to a greater degree around levels of community membership closer to their local community. Like Smits and Smith, Kubow *et al*, situate the practice of citizenship in time. "By the temporal dimension of citizenship, we mean that citizens, in dealing with contemporary challenges, must not be so preoccupied with the present that they lose sight of the past and the future" (pg. 123). The authors note that conceiving or understanding the nature of time is culturally bound. This has important curricular and pedagogic implications since students, especially younger students, have difficulty relating to or conceptualizing time; further, even older students, whose life experiences are still relatively limited, may find that their perception of time is limited in scope.

Kubow *et al* recognize that citizenship education is not specifically and overtly curricular and pedagogic, but to a fair extent a reflection of hidden curricula and a product of the total climate of the school. They seem to suggest that the environment of the school offers an opportunity for educators to proactively define normative concepts and behaviors that may have a long-term impact on the community, putting teachers at the forefront of defining good and meaningful citizenship. However, schools are only one dimension of youth socialization, and complementary messages need to be delivered by other social institutions such as the family, the media, as well as ethnic and religious institutions that are involved in that process. Strike (1998) argues that many key liberal theorists' arguments concerning child socialization only succeed when this message is consistent and congruent among all these civic socialization environments. Where it is not congruent, educational opportunities to define and expand the notion of citizenship are likely to fail.

Amorphous Citizenship in Education in English Canada

Capturing the nature and shape of the notion of citizenship is no less elusive in Canada than it is in other liberal democratic states, and may even be a more challenging concept to grasp. In Canada, the notion of citizenship as a distinct concept, describing the relationship between Canada as an independent nation-state and her citizens, is only about 60 years old. Although the evolution of Canadian identity occurred over a period of centuries, it is only in the post World War II era that the legal concept of Canadian citizenship developed, and it still had to coexist with British subject status until 1976 (Sears *et al.*, 1999). Canadians have long been engaged in pursuit of their own national identity. In the 20th century, Canada's status within the British Empire and later the

Commonwealth moved from dominion status to that of nation-state, although it still retains the British monarch as head-of-state. But acquiring nation-state status did not make Canadian identity and citizenship any more clear. In fact Canadians began, progressively, to recognize the complexity of the issues surrounding the nature of Canadian citizenship and identity as both possession and a domain of practice. Canada as a nation-state contends with a number of competing historical narratives based on language, ethnicity, and on deep historic and prehistoric territorial connections to the land. Canada, as a diverse community stretches the meaning and nature of the term 'nation'. Further, many nations exist within Canada's boundaries, yet Canada is also considered a 'nation' of immigrants; a community with representatives amongst its citizens drawn from virtually every other nation on Earth.

Central to discussions of the nature of Canadian citizenship and identity are claims to historic entitlement to resolve what it is to be Canadian. Sears, Clarke and Hughes (1999) refer to Charles Taylor's characterization of Canadian citizenship as oriented in two ways. The first of these orientations reflect English Canadian conceptions of citizenship, the latter reflects French Canadian and Aboriginal conceptions of Canadian citizenship: 1) On the relationship between state and individual, all individuals are equally endowed with the same rights and responsibilities; collective associations are a matter for the private sphere; 2) Individuals belongs to the larger community via their membership in constituent societies and the state has relationships with both individuals and those communities. This latter orientation is reflected in both compact and treaty federalisms.

Sears *et al* note that perceptions of the nature of citizenship and what it means to be a good citizen in Canada extend beyond the nature of the national social contract relationship between individual and state. Social and economic status play an important role in shaping the perception of what constitutes a good citizen and sets the trajectory and expectations for citizenship education in Canadian schools. They offer two visions: elitist and activist.

> For elitists, participation in public affairs by ordinary citizens beyond voting is not only undesirable, it is potentially dangerous. The good citizen, in the elitist conception of citizenship is knowledgeable about mainstream, hegemonic versions of national history as well as technical details of how political institutions function. He or she is loyal to the state, defers to authority and knows (and believes in) patriotic symbols and ceremonies as well as the national myths. The highest duty of citizenship in this view is to become as informed as possible about public issues and, based on this information, to vote for appropriate representatives at election time (1999, pg. 124).

Their activist vision of citizenship suggests that:

> good citizens participate actively in community or national affairs. [Good citizens] have a deep commitment to democratic values, including equal participation of all citizens in discourse, where all voices can be heard, and power (political, economic and social) is relatively equally distributed. These citizens are knowledgeable about how institutions and structures privilege some people while discriminating against others and are skilled at uncovering and challenging them (pg. 124).

Historically, according to Sears *et al*, it has been the elitist vision that has been most commonly reflected in most Canadian schools.

In *Understanding Citizenship,* Andrew Hughes (1994) explored the notion of citizenship in Canada by employing a Delphi model study. The title of his article alludes to the ambiguity of citizenship. He described the purpose of the study as "an attempt to probe the complex relationship that exists between the citizen and the state; the

relationship that may have its origins in the conferring of legal status of citizen but which is played out as a tension of give and take between individual and collectivity" (pg. 13).

Interestingly, in the initial round of statements he collected from participants in the study, no one considered the issue of the legal status of citizenship as having any relationship with good citizenship. What is good citizenship? Certainly some participants equated it with being a decent human being, while others expanded on this sense in that good citizens recognize and show concern for global issues and fundamental human rights. Good citizens are informed citizens, and all agreed on some sort of knowledge foundation, sense of identity and trajectory. Further, they all agreed that good citizenship has a participatory character and included aspects such as volunteering. In addition, they agreed that the potential for good citizenship should not be restrained because of economic or social disadvantages. This speaks to the importance of Marshall's and of Heater's social citizenship.

Key dispositions of citizenship were a domain of some disagreement. Although initially, most participants offered tolerance, progressively, this was seen as much more limited and negative in relation to the concept of respect. They also agreed on the sentiment of caring for the country, and although the term resonated strongly with panel members, the nature of caring was left ambiguous. Panel members did agree that good citizenship was reflected in dispositions that included open-mindedness, civic mindedness, respect, willingness to compromise, tolerance, compassion, generosity of spirit and loyalty.

In terms of 'good citizenship' there was some discussion as to the nature of the 'good'-ness, and whether the failure to practice good citizenship meant that one practiced

bad citizenship. Instead they moved toward the use on an *ideal of citizenship*. This ideal was something to aspire towards; collective goals to be pursued as a nation.

There was a consensus that the *ideal of citizenship* required citizens to be informed, at least to the extent that they had an understanding of some of their rights and responsibilities, as well as some sort of historical situatedness and a sense of where and how these rights and responsibilities evolved. Further, there was a consensus on the need to participate, but this was contingent on a degree of literacy, open-mindedness, ability and means to communicate and articulate ideas, and, that failing to be able to do so or to not know ones rights is akin to not having them or being denied them. This is in a sense a somewhat elitist conception, and has the potential to limit the degree of participation in a sort of *Peter Principle* kind of way, with the level of ability to participate bounded and constrained by a citizens capacity to communicate.

The panel did consider whether there is some real distinction between the character of good Canadian citizenship and good global citizenship. "There were various attempts to recognize the complimentarity and compatibility of the Canadian and global dimensions [of citizenship]. The difficulty seemed to lie in disentangling what might by (sic) *[be]* uniquely Canadian from the larger morass" (pgs. 24-25). Being a good Canadian citizen provides an avenue for good world citizenship; "Canadians who strive to achieve an ideal of citizenship in Canada would inevitably find themselves in harmony with the ideals of global citizenship" (pg. 25).

An issue that arises when considering all of these various models and conceptions of citizenship is that many of them tend to engage in universalizing treatments of citizenship that ignore forms of diversity that do not coincide with national, cultural,

ethnic, religious or linguistic diversity. The assumption that all citizens can benefit universally, ignores other dimensions of diversity that may constitute impediments to exercising and enjoying the benefits of citizenship. Critical theorists generally consider universal citizenship as an illusion, or as an impediment to genuine equality. Jennifer Tupper (2005, 2006) argues that universalized citizenship reinforces traditional hegemonic understandings of citizenship, ensuring that it is the privileged members of dominant communities that enjoy genuine access to the rights and privileges of citizenship. Members of the dominant communities often perceive universality of citizenship as effective because they have no difficulty exercising the rights and benefits of citizenship, themselves, and either naïvely or deliberately ignore those individuals and groups who experience more difficulty accessing the rights and benefits of citizenship.

According to Tupper (2006), members of the community, whose identities most clearly reflect the normative understanding of citizenship, apply social and political pressure to community and governmental institutions to maintain their privileged status vis-à-vis other individuals and groups that do not conform with the normative model. Schools reinforce a "normalized vision of good citizenship which constructs students as basically the same. The creation and implementation of standardized curriculum outcomes in social studies, uniform content, and common exams further reinforce the false universalism of citizenship embedded in education and promote an egalitarian conceptualization of education" (pg. 48). Macintosh and Loutzenheiser (2006) carry this argument further by employing queer theory to challenge the universalizing and heteronormative nature of citizenship, especially in the context of citizenship education. They argue that schools act similarly to other heteronormative public institutions that

marginalize queer students and queer members of the community, limiting their ability to enjoy the benefits and rights of citizenship unless they conform to hegemonic notions of citizenship established by the dominant community.

Critical feminism also subjects universalized citizenship to significant critique. According to this critique, universalized citizenship is firmly entrenched within liberal citizenship discourses which cultivate a clear distinction between public and private spheres; the separation between these spheres is "representative of the historical distinction between "male" and "female" as antagonistic universal categories" (Arnot & Dillabough, 1999, pg. 162). The public sphere, the domain of men is characterized as a place of rational, principled behavior. This is set against the private domain, a place of motherhood, symbolized by women. The antagonistic relationship between these two domains renders women as being less capable of practicing behaviors essential to citizenship (Arnot & Dillabough, 1999; Dillabough, 2006). Further, women are far more likely than men to have their opportunities to engage in active citizenship limited by economic constraints. Barriers to advancement and social/cultural expectations relating to the maintenance of the family and the private sphere have significant potential to deny women access to engage in citizenship activities in the public domain.

Conventional Models of Citizenship are No Longer Suitable

Globalizing forces such as the increasing role of nation-state membership or non-membership in transnational and supranational organizations, especially among Western liberal democracies, combined with increased global interconnectedness, have undermined the preexisting coincidence of political and economic boundaries and the power of states to exercise substantial controls over trade in goods and services. Melissa

Williams (2003) suggests that this has resulted in the displacement of traditional roles that states have played in the economic domain within their national boundaries and that it has significant implications for both Marshall's and Heater's conceptions of social citizenship. The resulting impact has been that programs intended to function in the interests of distributive justice, such as social welfare programs intended to ensure that no citizen is at too great an economic disadvantage to enjoy the benefits of his or her citizenship, or the opportunities to engage in the practice of citizenship, have suffered because the benefits are tied to more conventional notions of citizenship and sovereignty, and rely on defined boundaries to determine the territorial extent to which programs of distributive justice can be applied. In fact, Williams believes that it is distributive justice rather than national identity that is at the greatest risk from globalization.

In addition, globalization and changing global immigration patterns put pressure educators, scholars, theorists, and policymakers to reflect the transforming nature and character of and increasing plurality within liberal democratic nation-states such as Canada and the United States. Increasingly, immigrants to both countries are coming from the Middle East, Eastern and Southern Asia and from Africa to a far greater extent than they are from Europe. James Banks (2001, 2006) advocates a new conception of citizenship education that takes into account the rapidly changing nature of our national, supra-national and global communities; this means moving away from the older assimilationist and conformist models that had been encouraged in many countries such as the US, Canada, Britain and Australia. In these pluralistic communities, the author advocates the need to attach greater value the cultural assets immigrants bring, including culture, language and ethnic identity. He advocates a multicultural citizenship model

along the lines articulated by Will Kymlicka. Teachers need to foster in students a sense of global identification that stretches beyond their own national identity without extinguishing it.

> Citizens in a diverse democratic society should be able to maintain attachments to their cultural communities as well as participate effectively in the shared national culture. *Unity without diversity results in cultural repression and hegemony. Diversity without unity leads to Balkanization and the fracturing of the nation-state.* Diversity and unity should coexist in a delicate balance in democratic multicultural nation-states (Banks, 2006, pgs. 23-24).

Banks writes that teachers need to challenge the meta-narratives of Western assimilationist cultures. Central to this endeavor is helping students shape an identity that may be multidimensional in character, reflecting the diversity of backgrounds of students, while seeking common ground for them to identify with the nation-state to which they belong. Banks argues that students whose identities are composed of components from multiple sources are just as likely to develop deep attachments to their nation-state as those students who have been subjected more narrow conceptions of national identity, and that identity is not a zero-sum game.

Permeable Boundaries: Frontiers and Good Citizenship

Globalization, increasing global awareness and interconnectedness as well as increasing recognition of plurality and diversity in developed nation-states around the world, creates other forms of tension that stress conventional understandings of citizenship and add additional levels of complexity to citizenship education. Concepts such as global or world citizenship are showing up increasingly in curricula, adding further dimensions of complexity to what is, already, a concept that is difficult to grasp. In Alberta, for example, global citizenship is featured in grade three social studies as well as in the new Social Studies 10-1 and 10-2 programs. The specific outcomes in the grade

three program of studies, under the heading of values and attitudes, includes the expectation that students will learn to: 1) "recognize how their actions might affect people elsewhere in the world and how the actions of others might affect them," and 2) "respect the equality of all human beings" (Alberta Education., 2005, pg. 5). Further, global citizenship is defined as "[a] feeling of responsibility, beyond a country's borders, toward humanity" (pg. 8). In the rationale statement of the Alberta Education's new Social Studies 10-1, globalization and its connection to citizenship is recognized as "the process by which the world's citizens are becoming increasingly connected and interdependent," and that this "demands that students explore responsibilities associated with local and global citizenship and formulate individual responses to emergent issues related to globalization (2005, pg. 13). The inclusion of global citizenship in social studies programs of studies in Alberta, reflects recognition of the currency of the concept, although the treatment of global citizenship in this case, is still clearly well entrenched within the context of a conventional nation-state system.

Many scholars and theorists, though, are critical of the role that national boundaries play in defining the extent to which practices of good citizenship extend. Should learning, understanding and appreciating the diverse character of humanity and caring for the quality of life of others be treated as peripheral, or ignored because it occurs beyond of our national boundaries. Although both Gloria Ladson-Billings (2005) and Martha Nussbaum (1996) focus their attention on American classrooms when each offers a critique of the parochial nature of the world view that each believes is taught to students in the US, their observations likely reflect analogous attitudes in Canadian classrooms. Ladson-Billings critique draws attention to the unilingual naïveté of

American education that fails to prepare students for a global citizenship by not encouraging multilingualism. This reflects a degree of cultural arrogance that is based on the supposed ubiquity of English, and further reflects an assumption of perpetual American economic and cultural hegemony, while failing to recognize the temporally bound nature of empire reflected in Smith's (2006) Comparative Discourse of Empire. Nussbaum's critique of the particularistic nature of American education argues that too often the history, challenges, and problems faced in other nation-states are obscured or filtered by national boundaries that allow them to see only limited glimpses of the world, and only those things in that are in the national interest. Nussbaum asks if students should be "taught that they are, above all, citizens of the United States or should they be taught that they are, above all, citizens of a world of human beings, and that, while they happen to be situated in the United States, they have to share this world with the citizens of other countries" (1996, pg. 6)?

Nussbaum calls patriotism and nationalism an *easy sentiment*, and considers the boundaries of nation-states as artificial, contrived and irrational. She advocates a form of cosmopolitan citizenship that allows students to "learn to recognize humanity wherever they encounter it, undeterred by traits that are strange to them, and be eager to understand humanity in all its strange guises" (pg. 9). By employing the Jeffersonian language of the American Bill of Rights, she asks if *all human beings are equal and endowed with certain inalienable rights,* why should the endeavor to extend this concept end at the boundaries of the nation-state?

Nussbaum questions why Americans feel an entitlement to disproportionate access to goods and resources. She argues that since this level of access and affluence are

unlikely to be universalizable without ecological disaster, we need to teach children to be troubled by this. To do otherwise is to advocate moral hypocrisy by suggesting the possibility that all people in the world have the potential to achieve the same level of affluence that Americans currently enjoy. From this comes a challenge to educators to teach students to engage in moderate consumption and to tie in historical material that demonstrates that exploitive, consumptive empires are subject to collapse.

There are certainly critiques of the extent to which Nussbaum carries global citizenship without necessarily undermining the general sentiment, that, especially in the context of education, students need to learn to understand themselves in the context of a complex and interconnected world, and as members of humanity as a whole, rather than membership in just a part of it. Benjamin Barber writes:

> No one actually lives in the world in which the cosmopolitan wishes us to be good citizens. Rather, we live in this particular neighborhood of the world, that block, or this valley, that seashore, this family. Our attachments start parochially and only then grow outward. To bypass them in favor of an immediate cosmopolitanism is to risk ending up nowhere - feeling at home neither at home nor in the world (1996, pg. 34).

The sentimental character of the cosmopolitanism and global citizenship that Nussbaum advocates, along with its criticisms, demonstrates that one of the challenges in discussing citizenship at the nation-state level, that of legal status versus citizenship-as-desirable activity, also confounds the discourse surrounding global citizenship.

Treating global citizenship within curriculum as desirable activity is certainly a more pragmatic approach to understanding the sentiment and necessity of helping students to recognize and appreciate that they have a role and responsibility as members of the human community. Nel Noddings argues that the teaching of global citizenship is intended to promote peace and it "requires us to value the lives of all people, not just

those of our own nation. Students should be made aware that this ideal is always lost in all-out war" (2005, pg. 17). Learning to value other people means educators need to cultivate in their classrooms an environment where learning to care can flourish. However, students must learn that for caring to flourish it must not be made wholly obligatory. Noddings writes that "when compassionate response is made a matter of duty and obligation, there will be resistance… Under any workable moral code, we should be allowed to choose the arenas in which we will concentrate our care" (pg. 8).

Less Conventional Citizenship

There are other approaches to conceiving of citizenship that do not necessarily fit within the context of conventional conceptions regarding citizenship. Melissa Williams (2003) writes concerning the notion of *citizenship as shared fate*; according to Williams, it provides a framework for a post-modern conception of citizenship consisting of webs of relationships between individuals that can and do cross national boundaries. These webs form communities of interconnected individuals and groups of human beings, in which the actions of members of these communities have impact, both positively and negatively, on other members of that *shared fate* community. Like national-state communities, membership in shared fate communities is not necessarily voluntary, acknowledged or even recognized by all of its members. Williams writes "a community of shared fate is not an ethical community as such. Its members are not bound to each other by shared values or moral commitments, but by relations of interdependence, which may not be positively valued by its members" (pg. 229). This potentially offers a new avenue for conceiving of diverse communities, defined more by the interconnectedness of the network they belong to, then by the territory on which they are situated.

Such postmodern conceptions of citizenship may reflect, to some extent, the changing reality of transnational interconnectedness, but they do not provide any of the rights or benefits, such as protection or other elements of distributive justice available in liberal democratic nation-states. Shared fate communities require no sense of allegiance, and only general expectation of a commitment to reciprocity. In the context of education, such post-nation-state conceptions of citizenship may prove very difficult for students to grasp. Banks writes "Students find it difficult to view themselves as members of an international community not only because such a community lacks effective governmental bodies, but also because very few heroes and heroines, myths, symbols, and school rituals are designed to help students develop an attachment to and identification with the global community" (2006, pg. 33).

In order to help students become agents for actively engaging in global citizenship as a desirable activity in the pursuit of social justice, some identity constituted around national territory and values helps contextualize the action they are likely to pursue. In addition, students learn that the avenues to addressing social justice issues, beyond their own national boundaries, require an understanding of how to access national governmental personalities and agencies, as well as supranational and non-governmental agencies and bodies. Callan (2004) argues that national boundaries serve as a means for defining and limiting the size of the community of agents that have the most access to political decision-making bodies in a particular polity. This does not deny the civic responsibility for being conscious of reciprocal obligations to other affected communities that are not parties to the particular political community where a decision is taking place. Recognition of interdependence is critical, but allowing the polity to have no political

boundaries means the number of potential actor/agents in a decision making process would be exceptionally large.

(Good) Citizenship as the Goal of Public Education

In Canada, there has long been recognition of the roles that schools can play in developing a sense of national identity and citizenship; it was recognized in the early 20th century that schools play a key role in integrating and assimilating immigrants into the British/Canadian community (Case, Osborne, & Skau, 1998). Citizenship education, though, has been troubled by the lack of a homogeneous national identity or character, and this constantly puts Canadian national cohesion at risk. This is reflected in constant tension from founding communities, compounded with regional and linguistic pressures.

Case, Osborne and Skau (1998) write that Canadian schools teach Canadian history with little sense of enthusiasm or celebration; it tends to be detached, academic. Social studies or specific social science subjects, such as geography and history, seem to be the primary burden holders for citizenship education. These have traditionally been the home of civics education, and are typically factual and structural institution oriented. More recently, political education that contains some elements of transformative pedagogies has become more common. This has been reflected mostly in social studies programs, but has been reflected in science as well through STS (science, technology and society) initiatives. Human rights, global and international education, international development, trade, medicine, environmental studies and multicultural education all have citizenship educational aspects and are all examples of topics that have varying degrees of interdisciplinary overlap. Much of the focus, though, for citizenship education still

remains situated in social Studies, although bits and pieces are touched on in other humanities courses and in some science programs.

Isolating citizenship education or *ghettoizing* within the social studies subject area poses a potential risk that students may not necessarily extend the concepts that they learn within social studies to other subjects or discipline areas (Osborne, 2005; Richardson et al., 2003). George Richardson *et al* argue that there are two dimensions to this risk: First, by isolating it as a concept to be examined through high-stakes testing, and second, potentially, by not sufficiently recognizing the citizenship dimension of critical issues that have implication for humanity and the environment. According to Case *et al* (1998), when citizenship education initiatives are added to other subjects areas, efforts are often piecemeal, and exist as programs or outcomes that are isolated from the central themes in programs of study; too often they are add-ons, and are difficult to integrate into the program.

Ken Osborne criticizes the impact of neo-liberal doctrine on curriculum, active citizenship, environmental education, intercultural awareness, human rights, and social justice, which all take a back seat to instrumentalist curricula designed to prepare students for international competitiveness and entrepreneurialism (2001). Education becomes instrumentalist, focusing on career preparation instead of operating as a public good. Educating students for good citizenship may often reflect altruistic objectives of educators, curriculum developers, and educational theorists, but policy makers and members of dominant elites likely envision it as a means of maintaining social order and preparing citizens for the status quo (1997, 2001). Historically, according to Sears and Hughes (1996), citizenship education in Canada has been more aligned with elitist

conceptions of citizenship, and has cultivated an understanding of citizenship education as a means for developing political subjects. Ironically, when Sears and Hughes wrote in the mid 1990s, officially prescribed curricula advocated a surprising degree of activism, considering the neo-liberal ideology that is reflected in Canadian policymaking, yet policy may not necessarily be reflected in practice.

Osborne (2005) argues that citizenship curricula in schools is focused on delivering a conception of citizenship that is more in line with laudable, but certainly conservative character education goals: respect for other's rights, obeying the law, and engaging in suitably patriotic behaviors. Further, he argues that teachers may not consciously recognize the assimilative nature of citizenship education or recognize that some curriculum and pedagogical practices act to reinforce class divisions and maintain the status quo.

Fundamental to remedying curriculum and practices that act to replicate the status quo, isolating citizenship education within one subject area, encouraging passive acceptance of class divisions and limiting attention to real issues of social justice, requires teachers, administrators, district officials and policy makers to encourage the cultivation of more truly democratic classrooms. While research on what occurs in practice in Canadian Social Studies classrooms is limited (Sheilds & Ramsay, 2004), evidence from American social studies classrooms suggests that little real democratic behavior is occurring, and this deficiency is harmful to the political efficacy that students practice while they are still in school, and likely has an impact on their willingness to participate and engage in socially conscious justice oriented behavior in the future (Kahne, Rodriguez, Smith, & Thiede, 2000; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004).

Osborne writes that, ideally, the democratic classroom is student-centered, activity based, encourages broad student participation, critical thinking, avoids practices that might lead to group-think behaviors, and allows students to have a voice in decision-making processes in the classroom (2001). Westheimer and Kahne advocate the practice of social-justice oriented education, advocating transformative curricula that encourages political efficacy and activism, and empowers students to engage in social change and the pursuit of social justice. Such educational practices need not necessarily emphasize any one particular political or ideological perspective or set of priorities. "Those working to prepare justice oriented citizens for a democracy do not aim to impart a fixed set of truths or critiques regarding the structure of society. Rather, they work to engage students in informed analysis and discussion regarding social, political, and economic structures. They want students to consider collective strategies for change that challenge injustice, and where possible, address the root causes of the problem" (2004, pg. 243).

Carole Hahn's research reveals that students' sense of political efficacy comes not just from engaging in debate and discussion, but also by witnessing the process in practice. In Denmark, where there are more institutionalized forms of direct democratic processes, students appreciate that participation in the political process occurs more often than regular national elections (1998). Stretching this efficacy beyond political dimensions and into the realm of individual and collective agency in the pursuit of social justice, means teachers, especially those outside of the social studies subject area, need to start thinking of themselves as citizenship educators, and reflect on the political and economic assumptions that permeate both hidden and overt curricula.

Olsen and Lange (2004) focus on science education and the need for attention to what they term citizenship literacy. They argue that science education tends to be instrumentalist in approach, focusing students' attention on the development of skills and background necessary to help them access the knowledge economy. They believe that science teachers need to encourage questioning of the purpose and intentions of this knowledge to help students better understand who benefits. Science teachers need to emphasize the social and moral context of the content and processes addressed in their classrooms. By ensuring the presence of a human dimension, science teachers endeavor to help their students practice more effective critical thinking, balancing it against instrumentalist thinking and reasoning that treats problems on the basis of cost-benefit analysis, and excludes information that is unquantifiable.

Social Studies and Citizenship

In most jurisdictions in Canada, social studies or subjects in the social studies domain still tend to be the key sites for citizenship education(Case et al., 1998; Sheilds & Ramsay, 2004). Although there has been a visible push in the academy to encourage the development and extension of citizenship education to other subject areas beyond the social studies (Osborne, 2005; Richardson & Blades, 2001; Shields & Ramsay), the broadening of citizenship curricula should function to integrate citizenship discourses into the other subjects, while recognizing the centrality of social studies in tying these discourses together. Thus, social studies can maintain a pride of place in the context of citizenship education, serving as a point of convergence, helping students make interdisciplinary connections rather than operating as an island of citizenship education in a sea of so many other seemingly unrelated subjects.

Noddings (2005) emphasizes the importance of social studies as a discipline. She notes that the challenge for peace education in the context of social studies is partly rooted in the traditional mode of addressing social studies as political history, concentrating on wars, and on the rise and fall of nations. This draws attention to a significant challenge and problem that confronts social studies; that, historically, citizenship education, especially in the context of social studies and related subjects such as history and geography, has been based on the need for a strong state. In Canada this has meant focusing on historical narratives that distinguish Canada from its neighbor to the south. Historically, the pedagogical tendency had been to engage the subject in a passive, didactic approach (Osborne, 1997). This has meant providing students with a historical narrative consistent with hegemonic conceptions of national history and serving the interest of maintaining the status quo. Kent den Heyer (2006) argues that it is through social studies textbooks that historians, curricular authorities and policymakers give form and substance to heroes and events of the dominant narrative, in language that gives shape to students' imagination and conception of the community or nation-state to which they belong. According to den Heyer, the teaching of history as a nationalist Whig narrative, combined with conventional and conservative conceptions of citizenship as a list of virtues, fails to encourage students to develop a sense of agency; that children could act individually and collectively as agents of social change. He argues that narratives that name historical characters as agents of change, give students the impression that only people of heroic stature can have an impact, and this diminishes students' ability to conceive of themselves as change agents.

Thus, pedagogical approaches within social studies, especially in the context of citizenship education, need to embrace activist approaches and transformative pedagogies, encouraging teachers to cultivate democratic communities and behaviors within their classrooms. Conceiving of citizenship education within social studies and within other subjects areas, for that matter, as activist, means helping students to understand and appreciate the human and/or environmental dimensions of the issues that are being considered, since action they choose to take as students must be given careful consideration, since choosing to act or not act has consequences.

Further, the incorporation of action into a citizenship education as desirable practice within social studies requires that teachers help their students situate themselves within the context of time, and not feel constrained by time's limitations. This means, according to Hans Smits (2006), that both teachers and students need to recognize that the actions that they take may be limited by the time that they can commit, and that the issues that they are trying to help address are themselves situated in time, possessing both a past and a future. Action should not simply be a reaction to the immediate but it must be imbedded in time. Teachers must also help their students to understand that the scale of an issue or problem, whether spatial or temporal, should not be a deterrent to act. Students must learn to challenge historical situatedness because they enter stories (and history) already in progress and they are acting within a large and complex historical fabric; every moment is interwoven and interconnected with others in the continuum from the past to the future.

Citizenship Education beyond the Boundaries of Social Studies

If the general purpose of education is to prepare students for good or useful citizenship, it would seem peculiar to me, as it seems it does for many citizenship education scholars, that citizenship education is almost exclusively the domain of social studies. Does citizenship education have a place in other subject areas? In considering the challenge of making citizenship education a consciously considered element of other subject areas, James Banks argues that teachers in mathematics and the sciences may not have the kind or depth of knowledge in their subject area that would allow them to design lessons that challenge cultural assumptions about knowledge, or consider perspectives based on non-Western frames-of-reference (2006). Banks write that:

> Few teachers seem able to identify and describe the assumptions and paradigms that underlie science and mathematics. They often make such statements as, 'Math and science have no cultural contexts or assumptions. The disciplines are universal across cultures.' Knowledge about the philosophical and epistemological issues and problems in science and mathematics and the philosophy of science, is often limited to graduate seminars and academic specialists in these disciplines (pg. 8).

He suggests that it is all too common that "... disciplines are often taught to students as a body of truth not to be questioned or critically analyzed" (pg. 10). Teachers who are well established in their practice, may not necessarily consider that changes in the demographic character of Canada and other Western liberal democracies, and the increasing degrees of global interconnectedness and interdependency means that they need to examine and reflect on the culturally based assumptions that they have always made with regard to their discipline or subject area. Although this has particular resonance in mathematics and the sciences (Olson & Lang, 2004), it should similarly resonate in other core subject areas such as English language arts. Banks (2006) calls for

the development of a multicultural literacy that helps students and teachers to "…identify the creators of knowledge and their interests, to uncover the assumptions of knowledge, to view knowledge from diverse ethnic and cultural perspectives, and to use knowledge to guide action that will create a humane and just world" (pg. 24). This approach is reflected in the calls to move beyond the centrality of the Western canon of literature, opening opportunities for students to be exposed to other voices (Johnston, 2001; Ladson-Billings, 2005).

Diversity and Education for (Good) Citizenship

Eamonn Callan writes that the function of education in liberal democratic societies is centered on the promotion of "material prosperity and the maintenance of civil peace, respect for liberty, and the just distribution of wealth and privilege" (1997, pg. 1) Yet education for good citizenship is not solely the domain of schools; family, religious, cultural, and ethnic institution all play key roles in shaping the attitudes, behavior, dispositions and loyalties central to citizenships and identity (Callan, 1997, 2004; Kymlicka, 2001; Strike, 1998; Williams, 2003). In Canada, as in other Western liberal democratic nation-states, increasing pluralism resulting from immigration, and from increasing recognition of existing forms of diversity create significant challenges for educators and curriculum designers: The need and desire to reflect and maintain diversity must be balanced with the necessity of fostering common bonds of attachment reflecting shared democratic values as well as a collective commitment to the survival and prosperity of the whole community.

Currently, the degree of diversity in Canada's population reflects a complex community and polity whose spatial and temporal connection to Canada vary from

prehistoric to the most contemporary, and encompass a wide range of religious, ethnic and linguistic communities. Each of these communities brings with them its own values, histories, and traditions, along with its own epistemologies and ontologies. The desire to maintain these elements of diversity can create circumstances in which certain practices of a community may be incompatible or perceived as incompatible with the virtues, dispositions and loyalties that are central to Western liberal democracies, and potentially incompatible with Western liberal values.

Although the protection of privacy and what occurs in the private domain are central pillars of liberal democracy, they create a challenge for educators, theorists and policymakers, when illiberal practices that occur within the private domain undermine the values, dispositions and loyalties that are fundamental to liberal democracy and good citizenship. Kymlicka (1995) and Callan , for example, believe that a tolerant liberal democratic community can permit groups of "like-minded citizens to create educational institutions that reflect their distinct way of life, even if that entails some alienation from the political culture of the larger society" (Callan, 1997, pg. 9). Ken Strike, in offering his congruence argument, questions whether the liberal democratic values learned by students in such parochial schools have the potential to influence or alter those practices and dispositions incompatible with their own community's values, and suggests that liberal governments and communities are more compatible with associations and institutions whose practices reflect liberal values and ideals. According to Strike:

> *Liberal societies have a legitimate interest in regulating both public and private associations in order to produce liberal citizens.* The factual premise is this: *Liberal citizens are more likely to be produced by associations that hold liberal beliefs and conduct and advance their views according to liberal principles.* The congruence argument thus claims that it is in the interest of liberal societies that

> both public and private associations accept and practice liberal ideals (1998, pg. 346).

Strike, in considering the writing of John Rawls and William Galston, argues that they offer a political liberal domain diminished in scale that permits limited civic education and socialization concerning basic rights to the children of groups who practice comprehensive doctrines that include some illiberal practices. He characterizes Rawls's ethical liberalism as permitting the illiberal practices of comprehensive doctrine groups, so long as these practices remain in the private domain, and thus they are allowed some degree of latitude to engage in group autonomy over individual autonomy as long as these practices are confined to that group. So long as non-members are not oppressed, and so long as group members are participating in the practices of comprehensive doctrine groups out of individual choice, consent, or free association, Rawls would tolerate oppressive practices within these groups in private. What he fails to account for, according to Strike, is that freedom to exit or dissociate from such a group may come with significant consequences and costs that may be equally or even more oppressive.

The problem of how to accommodate communities with doctrinal differences, seemingly incompatible with Western liberal conceptions of good citizenship, is central to education. Strike suggests that finding the balance between liberal values and illiberal practices "requires that we accept outcomes that have real costs. Freedom of conscience may require that we accept groups and practices that may socialize children who will not support or not fully support liberal values. It may require that we accept some forms of injustice in order to avoid others. Nothing in liberalism requires that the world in which we live will be such as to allow us to fully achieve all liberal values simultaneously" (pgs. 358-359). Callan (2004) argues that our understanding of citizenship and the educational

practices related to it must be revised to reflect what Rawls calls the *permanent fact of pluralism*, and abandon the idea of a homogeneous nation-state. In general, all of these theorists concur that mechanisms of reasonable compromise and reciprocity are essential to accommodating the interest of diverse religious and ethnic communities in a pluralist liberal democratic nation-state. Schools and curriculum offer an avenue for engaging in dialogue that reflect shared values central to the maintenance and health of a pluralist society. "The need to perpetuate fidelity to liberal democratic institutions and values from one generation to another suggests that there are some inescapably shared educational aims, even if the pursuit of these conflicts with the convictions of some citizens," according to Callan (1997, pg. 9). He suggests, though, in the interest of avoiding repression, and of reflecting important liberal democratic values, "religious communities be given latitude to educate the children of their communities, even if that entails some alienation from the political culture of the larger society" (pg. 9).

What Does this Mean for Educators?

The ambiguity, malleability and amorphousness of citizenship, particularly in the context of citizenship education has allowed theorists, policy makers and teachers to engage in the conversation and practice of citizenship education without necessarily having to share a specific understanding of what citizenship is, and what it means to practice good citizenship. Yet the tensions that exist within the communities that we all belong to, from local through global, reflect the currency and importance of examining what it means to practice and teach for good citizenship. Are teachers, in their role of educators for good citizenship, succeeding in confronting the challenge of trying to capture some of the essential substance of citizenship while simultaneously considering

and reflecting on how the changes that are occurring in those communities are impacting and transforming the nature of citizenship for themselves, their students, and for human beings all over the planet?

Much of the research on citizenship education, especially in Canada, tends to be qualitative in character and relatively small in scale. Given the currency of citizenship education within academic scholarship and the increasing presence of citizenship as a core concept in social studies, as in Alberta, many assumptions have been made by scholars, curriculum writers and policy makers, that the revitalization of citizenship curricula will have a positive and constructive outcome on the behaviours, attitudes and dispositions of students.

Clearly, education for good citizenship and citizenship education in all their respective forms and dimensions are exceptionally complex concepts. Changes in demographics within Canada and other Western liberal democratic nation-states force educators and communities in general to confront the seeming contradictions and paradoxes of citizenship theory; at the same time the boundaries of citizenship are continually stretched through the interconnectedness and interdependence that are products of globalization. The challenge for teachers is not just continually adapting to citizenship's dynamic nature, but also understanding how to take advantage of the opportunity to exploit the ambiguity of citizenship, by expanding and transforming the concept.

Chapter Three

Methodology

Focus of the Study

The central question of this study focuses on how the six participant-teachers, all from one public high school in a major metropolitan centre in Alberta, each understand and conceive of their role as citizenship educators and as teachers of good citizenship. The purpose of the study is to expose a snapshot of the range of conceptions of citizenship that have been articulated to me by these teachers at the time of their interview, including how they believe that citizenship education fits into their practice, and how congruent their understandings are with each other and with the rationale and definitions that may appear in programs of study in Alberta, as well as with citizenship related outcomes, both literal and implied, that are reflected in the programs of study in their subject areas and disciplines.

Teachers, as frontline agents of citizenship education and education for good citizenship in the public sphere, have a significant responsibility to help their students develop and shape their personal identity and sense of what it means to be a citizen. Regardless of discipline or subject area specialty, teachers, through their own practices, and their role in cultivating the climate of the schools and classrooms, as well as through their participation in the communities in which they are situated, are models for students on the practice of citizenship. Through the use curricular documents and support materials such as textbooks, videos, and other media, teachers employ everyday in their classrooms, students are constantly bombarded, overtly and covertly, with messages about what it means to be a citizen and what it means to practice good citizenship. In

light of the changing demographic profile of our schools and communities, evolutionary processes in technology that continue to transform media, globalizing forces of trade in goods, service and information, and the degree to which public sphere institutions such as schools can be agencies of the status quo or vehicles of social change and justice, teachers conceptions of citizenship, and their practice as citizenship educators is of significant importance. How teachers, individually and in concert, treat citizenship education and teaching for good citizenship may have a significant impact on current and future public discourse on this normative concept.

The Research Question

How do teachers understand the notion of citizenship, and how does their understanding of this notion impact their personal perception of their practice? In the previous chapter I argued that conceptions of citizenship reflected in scholarly literature demonstrate a significant degree of variability; they are ideologically driven, temporally and spatially situated, and subject to continual evolution. While the definitions in dictionaries and curricular documents are subject to occasional revision, the concept of citizenship in both public and private domains is subject to a continual tension and pressure from forces operating at every level of human community. The research question is intended to provide an opening to discover how such tensions and pressures shape and impact the practice of teaching, and to consider avenues for further research.

Choosing a Research Approach

A fundamental step in any scholarly research is choosing an appropriate methodological approach. A wide array of quantitative and qualitative approaches exist that would lend themselves well to investigating this question. Yet, all research has

limitations and constraints; key among these are time, money and sufficient numbers of willing participants or respondents. Choices had to be made within the context of such constraints as to what avenue of investigation would yield the most useful data. I chose a qualitative approach over quantitative for several reasons. First among these was central to the research question: Whether there really was a significant variation in teachers' conceptions of citizenship, and what the nature of the variation was, if it existed at all. Although there are quantitative approaches that would have allowed me to measure such differences, and perhaps measure degree of identification with a particular definition and related concepts using a Likert scale, such a study would require that I provide a range of definitions and conceptions of citizenship. This sort of approach has the potential to miss potential variations, and ignores deeper understandings and conceptions that a purely quantitative research instrument may not be able to measure. In addition, recruiting a sizable sample of respondents would be required in order to obtain a statistically valid response. Securing such a large sample among teachers, using a sound and secure instrument has the potential to be very expensive to produce, distribute and recover.

Qualitative approaches offered a better route to researching the question, and capturing a deeper and richer understanding of the relationship between conception of citizenship and teaching practice. Yet, within qualitative approaches, choice of method is not a neutral act (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The choice reflects the experience, ideology, culture and other identity elements of the researcher (Bassey, 1999; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Fine, Weis, Weseen, & Wong, 2000; Kincheloe & McLaren, 1999). As a researcher with experience teaching in the classroom and working with teachers in a range of subject areas, I already had some suspicions about what I might find. But I also

had experienced the evolution of my own conception of citizenship, and have reflected to some extent on what I believe are the sources and influences on how I understand the concept. I recognize that the forces and influences on how I understand citizenship are complex and intertwined. With this in mind, it is a fair assumption that other teachers' conceptions of citizenship are equally subject to a range of influences, combined with ideological, cultural, and experiential forces.

Research Method

I chose a case study model as the mode of investigation best suited to both engage the research question and work within limitations of time and money. The scale of the study was small. Six teachers at one high school in a major urban centre in Alberta participated in the study. Each participant interviewee sat for a semi-structured interview with me, approximately one hour in length. All the interviews took place at the school between November 1, 2005 and November 23, 2005. Four of the teachers who participated taught in core subject areas of mathematics, social studies, English language arts, and the sciences. Of the other interviewees, one is a reading specialist, and another is a Career and Technology Studies (CTS) specialist whose background also included significant experience teaching physical education.

Choosing a case study approach was based on the need to develop a sense of the range of potential variations of understandings of the notion of citizenship among the teachers, and a sense of how these understandings concur or are congruent with conceptions of citizenship reflected in curriculum documents and support materials. As a mode of investigation, case studies have clear boundaries (Bassey, 1999; Creswell, 1998; Merriam, 1998; Stake, 2000). According to Stake, cases are unique, possessing their

own history, setting, political, social and economic contexts, and take place in complex environments (2000). Yet both Bassey (1999) and Merriam (1998) suggest that the choice of a case, particularly in the context of what Stake calls instrumental and comparative case studies, is the potential for some degree of generalizability to other similar settings. According to Merriam (1998, pg. 41), "[t]he case study offers a means of investigating complex social units consisting of multiple variables of potential importance in understanding the phenomenon," but she offers the caveat that the case only suggests something about the whole, and is not an account of the whole.

Based on Stake's description of the categories of case study, this particular study falls within the instrumental category. He writes that in instrumental case study "[t]he case is of secondary interest, it plays a supportive role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else" (2000, pg. 437). Creswell, as well, writes that instrumental case study employs a specific case to illuminate an issue that may not necessarily be intrinsic to the research site (2005). This illumination means that the case study itself, and this MEd thesis in which it is situated, offers more than a description of what the participants said. According to Merriam, "[a] case study design is employed to gain an in-depth understanding of the situation and the meaning for those involved. The interest is in the process rather than outcomes, in context rather than specific variables, in discovery rather than confirmation" (1998, pg. 19).

Drawing the Sample

The nature and size of the sample in this case study reflects the need to find a collection of participants who are good candidates to yield deep and rich responses to the interview questions, who are willing to voluntarily participate, and who are accessible to

the researcher with consideration to financial cost and time. Merriam writes that "[s]ince generalization in a statistical sense of qualitative research, probabilistic sampling is not necessary or even justifiable in qualitative research" (1998, pg. 61) Instead she suggests employing a purposeful sampling approach that maximizes the opportunity to learn about the phenomenon in question.

Although the sample size in this study was small, just six teachers, the number of teachers needed to participate was set to maximize variation in responses. Initially, the intention had been to focus on recruiting core subject specialists, and have a higher representation from the sciences. The teachers who did volunteer to participate in the study each came from separate subject areas and specialties. In addition, if it was possible, I wanted to maximize variation in teaching experience. Among the teachers who participated in the study were two who were in their second year of professional practice, one with about ten years of teaching experience and three had more than twenty years of experience in the classroom.

The process of recruiting participants began in October 2005, once I had obtained ethics approval and approval from the school board for the site I wanted to use. Since all teachers at the research site were potential participants, I approached the school administration about how best to communicate with their teaching faculty. The school principal preferred that I draft a letter to his staff, and circulate it by email (Appendix A). I received three responses within days of my initial letter, and a subsequent email was sent two weeks after the initial email, and elicited three more participants.

Conducting the Interviews

Silverman writes that talk "has increasingly become recognized as the primary medium through which social interaction takes place" (1999, pg. 821). Although it might have been beneficial to the study to engage in some observation of the participant engaging in their practice, the limited resource of time meant that all of the field research had to be completed by the end of November 2005, when my wife and I were expecting the birth of our daughter. Thus, the focus of the field research is on what the participants articulated to me through conversation. Merriam writes, "[i]nterviewing is necessary when we cannot observe behaviour, feelings, or how people interpret the world around them" (1998, pg. 72). Each participant-teacher in the study sat with me for a semi-structured interview that was expected to be about one hour in length. The majority were right on the mark, although one ran about forty-five minutes, and another nearly ninety minutes. At the beginning of each interview, participants signed a consent form (Appendix B) and were provided with a list of questions and sub-questions that would guide the interview (Appendix C).

With each subsequent interview my confidence grew as an interviewer; I was more comfortable departing from the script, and following up on responses that intrigued me. In addition, minor modifications were made to the question guide to reflect ideas that were drawn from previous interviews.

All of the interviews were digitally recorded using a laptop computer and a freeware audio recording and editing program called Audacity (Mazzoni *et al.*, 2004). The program offered exceptionally high fidelity, and simple, direct access to any portion of the recording. All of the interviews took place in each participant-teacher's classroom,

with the exception of one which took place in a conference room at the school. For each interview, the participant and I wore headsets with attached microphones that were plugged directly into my notebook computer. Files were saved in the program's proprietary format and then converted into Windows Audio File (.wav) format.

Engaging in Analysis

Qualitative research has been subject to an evolutionary process that has impacted the relationship between researcher and research, along with the role and place of qualitative research within the academy. The most recent of seven historical moments in the evolution of qualitative research, according to Denzin and Lincoln is one that "asks that the social sciences and the humanities become sites for critical conversations about democracy, race, gender, class, nation-states, globalization, freedom, and community" (2000, pg. 3). Yet in facilitating such critical conversations, consideration needs to be given to the language employed, and to the context in which that language is used.

Engaging in these critical conversations within and beyond the academy with the goal of shaping or influencing a transformation of practice requires the researcher to find some ground to establish the foundation for the development of theory. To do so, the researcher must place himself/herself within some sort of theoretical/interpretive paradigm. Since qualitative methodologies often focus on language and discourse, whether in text or in speech, the researcher operates as an interpretive lens, analyzing the character of language of the research subject(s) in relation to the context in which that use of language was employed.

Kincheloe and McLaren write that "critical researchers have come to understand language is not a mirror of society. It is an unstable social practice whose meaning shifts,

depending on the context in which it is used" (1999, pg. 284). In order to explore the conceptions of citizenship revealed in the interviews I will draw on my rudimentary understanding of philosophical hermeneutics and on critical theory to gain deeper insight into what citizenship education and teaching for good citizenship meant to the participants in this study at the time of their interview.

Schwandt suggests that through philosophical hermeneutics the researcher recognizes their own place within the research by suggesting that "understanding requires the *engagement* of one's biases" (2000, pg. 195). He adds

> The point is not to free ourselves of all prejudice, but to examine our historically inherited and unreflectively held prejudices, and alter those that disable our efforts to understand others, and ourselves…Understanding is participative, conversational, dialogic. It is always bound up with language and is achieved only through a logic of questions and answers.

Along with Denzin and Lincoln (2000), Schwandt further recognizes that meaning is temporally situated possessing cultural and historical context. "Philosophical hermeneutics oppresses naïve realism or objectivism with respect to meaning and can be said to endorse the conclusion that there is never a finally correct interpretation" (2000, pg. 195).

Both philosophical hermeneutics and critical theory perspectives recognize the power of language to act as a means of control (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1999; Schwandt, 2000). Both offer a counter to positivist conceptions of language as a rationally agreed upon symbolic system, with arguments that language is employed in the public domain as a means of maintaining a hegemonic social, political, and economic structure.

Rooted in the Frankfurt School and in the writing of theorists such as Gramsci, critical theory examines power relationships within communities and societies with the

goal of engaging in critical emancipation of subordinated groups (Inwood, 1995; Kincheloe & McLaren, 1999; McLellan, 1995). "Gramsci understood that dominant power in the 20th century is not always exercised simply by physical force but also through social psychological attempts to win peoples consent to domination through cultural institutions such as the media, schools, family and the church" (Kincheloe & McLaren, 1999, pg. 283). In the context of public education, do we actively and effectively question who has the power to speak with authority in our own society and communities, and who has the power to define the meaning of concepts in the public sphere? Whose voices are marginalized or ignored? Kincheloe and McLaren write that in educational contexts "legitimated discourses of power insidiously tell educators what books may be read by students, what instructional methods may be utilized and what belief systems and views of success may be taught" (1999, pg. 284).

In analyzing my conversations with the participants in this study, I am curious as to what assumptions are made about knowledge and language in the classroom and within the curriculum and support materials. Are there concepts or assumptions that teachers take for granted? Are their potential responses left unsaid? Bassey writes that the challenge that confronts the interpretive researcher analyzing text and speech is that he sees language as a "more or less agreed upon symbolic system" where meaning is to a degree individually constructed (1999, pg. 43). He writes that "the public world is positivist; the private world is interpretive" (pg. 44). In the context of education, policy makers, curriculum designers, and members of the public at large may assume that shared meaning exists in the public domain. But according to Bassey, interpretive case study research reveals that those positivist assumptions about shared meaning are not reflected

in practice. Thus, in the classroom, variations in meaning may have the potential to impact how teachers engage and reflect certain concepts, such as citizenship, in their practice.

Ethical Considerations

The field component of this study was conducted subsequent to the completion and acceptance of an application for ethics approval to the Faculties of Education and Extension Research Ethics Board (EE REB). In this study, participants responded to questions that they had not seen in advance of the interview. Before each interview began participants read and signed a consent form (Appendix A) and were informed that they could withdraw from this study at any time. Each participant's identity remains anonymous, and the specific research site has not been identified by name, nor has its location or district affiliation been identified. Participants have been assigned a pseudonym that suggest the gender of the teacher and reflects the Western/European heritage of all of the teachers who chose to participate in this study. Although all of the participants are of European descent, this is in no way meant to suggest anything about the demographic profile of the faculty at the research site.

I did not specifically enquire about religion or religious affiliation of the teachers that participated in the study. Religious beliefs and the values derived from them likely impact conceptions of citizenship; however, although I did not ask about religion, directly, I did ask questions that, in some cases, yielded responses reflecting religious beliefs and values. All of the primary questions and their sub-questions (Appendix C) were chosen to draw out how each participant understood the concept of citizenship and how it fit into their practice. All researchers must recognize that any research involving

living subjects has the potential for harm (Fine et al., 2000; Merriam, 1998). None of the questions were especially controversial, or was likely to elicit a response that could put their employment or position at risk. The only potential for harm in this study could more likely be connected with its potential to change a teacher's practice once he/she has reflected on their role as a citizenship educator and how the concept of citizenship is integrated into the curriculum, their practice and into the school environment.

Verification

The validity or verifiability of data gathered and analyzed in qualitative research presents some challenges. The scale of the sample of qualitative studies is often significantly smaller than in quantitative research (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000). The snapshot of reality revealed by a study such as this reflects and is shaped by the researcher's background, experience, social class, cultural and religious affiliation, ideology and a range of other components of identity (Bassey, 1999; Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Merriam, 1998). Thus all the aspects of the study from premise through to the completion of the study are filtered through the theoretical/philosophical frame of the researcher (Merriam, 1998). From an ethical standpoint, what the researcher chooses to include or exclude shapes the nature of the data and which data the researcher elects to use.

If the objective is some degree of generalizability to a larger population, what Bassey calls fuzzy generalizations, certain measures need to be applied by the researcher to justify any generalization that extends beyond the sample of subjects who participated in the study. Merriam writes that "[i]n a multi-case or cross-case analysis, the use of predetermined questions and specific procedure for coding and analysis enhances the

generalizability of findings in the traditional sense" (1998, pg. 208). In both Merriam and in Creswell (1998), rich and deep descriptions and cross-case (or cross-sub-case in this study) analysis offer the opportunity for the researcher to find connections, points on convergence and variability that allows for the triangulation of data.

Conclusions drawn from the data in a qualitative study such as this are not intended to be addressed through a prescriptive solution. The purpose of any interpretive analysis within qualitative methodologies is to achieve some degree of understanding rather than offer an explanation (Bassey, 1999; Merriam, 1998; Schwandt, 2000). This study should reveal opportunities for further research and may offer specific avenues that need further exploration.

The Interview Questions

I developed a series of key questions to better appreciate how the participant-teachers/interviewees in this study understood the concept of citizenship at the time of each interview. These were intended to elicit deep and rich responses, and yield insight into how each participant's conception of citizenship shapes their personal perception of professional practice. Initially, I had intended on opening up the interview process by asking each interviewee to provide his or her own definition of citizenship. I had believed that in circumstances such as this interview process that participants would articulate a long, rich and complex response. After testing this idea I realized that this question often drew very brief responses; these reflected little more than a dictionary based understanding or conventional notions of rights and responsibilities or perhaps character education related responses. I asked about a personal definition of citizenship as a sub-question of the first question, and it yielded a better response from the study's

participants when it was situated within this context than it had when I had initially tested this question. I needed questions that would work in conjunction with each other to set the tone for the interview, and draw out from the participants' response a deeper degree of insight into the central phenomenon.

I settled on seven primary questions that I believed would reveal sufficient insight into these teachers' individual understandings of their roles as both citizenship educators and as teachers of good citizenship. The distinction within and between these two roles of the teacher as a citizenship educator is intended to be ambiguous and overlapping; however, the former is intended to suggest the traditional conception of public education as preparation for citizenship, and the latter as modelling practice.

1. *What is citizenship education and where does it fit in the curriculum?*

This question was intended to encourage each participant-teacher/interviewee to reflect on the relationship between organized public education and its goal of cultivating good citizenship. I was looking for a broad understanding of the nature and purpose of citizenship education, as each participant currently conceived of it. Some of the sub-questions following this question included defining elements of this question, including meanings of citizenship and curriculum. In addition, interviewees were asked about the nature of critical citizenship. *What sort of skills and abilities do students need to develop to engage topics and issues that have significant social, cultural, political and economic impact? How are teachers, regardless of discipline, preparing students to make critical decisions on the products they consume?* By products, I mean more than goods and services purchased; how do these teachers encourage their students to use media and

consume knowledge critically to understand their impact on the communities and the world that surrounds each of them. Kellner writes:

> Critical citizenship thus involves cultivating to read and critique the texts of one's own and other cultures, including political and media discourses, television programming, popular music, advertising and other cultural forms. Thus a public pedagogy articulates with critical cultural studies that together require progressive educators to rethink the concepts of literacy and the very nature of education in any hi-tech and rapidly evolving society (2005, pg.53).

Additional sub-questions asked interviewees to think of the program of studies in their own subject areas as a framework for citizenship education, and how they can shape the specific outcomes to make citizenship education meaningful. Should teachers be expected to incorporate citizenship education outcomes in their practice, even if they are not clearly articulated in programs of study in their subject area? Might teachers consider such an effort as a further burden, or as a responsibility and obligation of their practice? The challenge of getting teachers to think about crafting their practice and shaping their lessons to encourage meaningful citizenship may be particularly daunting in subject areas where citizenship outcomes may only exist implicitly or where they seem to be entirely absent.

2. *How do events in the communities that you (each participant) belong to from local through global shape the ways in which you engage in your teaching practice?*

The notion of belonging to a community is a central one in citizenship, and this question is based on a Martha Nussbaum's conception of affiliation with different levels or strata of community, each existing concentrically in relation to one another, from the most local communities such as the classroom and school, to global communities (1996). Without being too leading, the intent of the question was to draw out from each

participant a sense of their relationship to the world and the communities in which they teach. Where do our responsibilities to fellow human beings lie? Nussbaum argues that national boundaries are arbitrary and are an impediment to social justice. The evolution of electronic media has made news of events and crises around the world available to us virtually instantaneously (Osler & Starkey, 2005). Are teachers thinking of global or transnational issues when they talk about citizenship or about events and issues with citizenship related implications? Are teachers consciously thinking about the culture of security and the disappearance of privacy?

3. *What sources shaped your understanding of citizenship and how has your understanding of citizenship changed over time?*

This particular question is the most biographical in scope of all the questions I asked. The intent of the question was to have interviewees reflect on the origins and development of their own personal understanding of citizenship; potential sources might include school, family, religious and ethnic communities, a wide variety of media and literature, as well as social and political affiliations. Sub-questions related to consideration of the events and forces that might have influenced changes in the participant's understanding of citizenship and citizenship education. A further sub-question asked interviewees to reflect on their media choices, and how such media might affect their own perception of citizenship and the importance of citizenship education.

4. *How does citizenship education fit into your subject area and into your classroom and practice?*

This question required significant reflection on the part of interviewees, and sought to understand how they each understood their role as citizenship educators; this

issued carries substantial weight in this project and requires a degree of consideration of the pedagogical realms that it touches. In an era where neo-liberal economic ideologies have diminished the role and status of the state, teachers must remain conscious of how these changes impact notions of citizenship. Communications media and an international marketplace that operates in a 'just-in-time' fashion, means teachers need to help students appreciate that the boundaries and control that nation-states exercise has been eroded (Castells, 2000).

Through this question interviewees were asked to reflect on how citizenship education fits into the program of studies in their subject area(s) and into the support materials that are used in the classroom. Additionally, the question sought to examine the deliberate efforts that each interviewee might take to integrate citizenship education curricula into their own classroom and practice. *What risks are you willing to undertake to give real meaning and purpose to citizenship education?* And, *how willing are you to question the universalist (and positivist) assumptions that are inherent in official citizenship education discourses?* The first question asks the participants about their willingness to test the boundaries of their pedagogic practice. It is intended to draw out what sort of strategies these teachers might consider to make citizenship education more meaningful to their students. The second question was intended to reveal whether the interviewee had ever really deeply questioned the liberal democratic foundations of the notion of citizenship. Jennifer Tupper writes that schools are agents of a false universalism and "the deep language employed in the curriculum of citizenship [is] predicated upon the historical traditions of the dominant cultural groups and constituted by certain rules, standards and norms implicit in its context" (2005, pg. 16). Even by

making a deliberate effort to integrate citizenship education into the curriculum, regardless of the discipline, are teachers empowering their students to think critically about citizenship related issues and to consider other voices, perspectives and narratives? Are teachers themselves engaged in this critical activity, or are they simply engaged in reproducing the existing assimilationist hegemonic model of citizenship education (Osborne, 2001)?

A further dimension of this question asked to what degree current citizenship education initiatives encourage students to be activist citizens, rather than conceding decision-making to the dominant elite. Although programs of study in many subject areas in many provinces assert activist goals of citizenship education, there is a gap between the rhetoric of citizenship education and practice (Osborne, 2001; Sears et al., 1999) . According to Osborne, much of the language of citizenship education is found in preambles and rationale statements, but receives little real attention in programs of study (Osborne, 2001).

5. *What is a democratic classroom?*

How teachers structure and control their classroom environment inevitably has some impact on students' conceptions of citizenship, and thus, their appreciation of how to act and interact with their peers. Schools teach acceptance of rules and power structures, and thus acceptance of the status quo, as well as social and economic structures that exist outside the school (Osborne, 1997). How are rules established and enforced in the classroom and in the school as a whole? Are students encouraged to participate? If so, what is the nature of participation? Are there specific types of students or groups of students who participate? Are there individual students or groups of

students who are encouraged to participate in class? Are there any who are discouraged? Teachers may have a tendency to treat students differently depending on their academic stream, or their socio-economic background. "[There are] two different kinds of citizenship education in operation: middle-class students are taught to be active and participate, to take charge; working class students are taught to follow instructions" (Osborne, 2001, pg. 33). Although there is limited data on congruence between democracy as content and democracy as practice in classrooms in Canada, studies such as the one publish by Kahne *et al*, suggest that at least in the case of social studies classrooms in Chicago, few were places of democracy in action, although this improves to some extent with the grade-level of the students and with socio-economic background (2000). Does such democratic practice have analogues in other disciplines, and in Canadian classrooms?

I asked interviewees to reflect on whether their own classrooms are democratic spaces. I expected that virtually all of the participants would respond that their classrooms are democratic spaces, yet what each participant teacher believes constitutes a democratic space varied. Responding to this question involves considering how much cooperation and collaboration among students and between teacher and students is encouraged; how do they foster attitudes of tolerance and respect, and to what degree do they encourage critical thinking. Further, participants were asked about classroom rules; how they are set and enforced. In addition, they were asked about the role students have in classroom decisions, and the means by which these decisions are made. Are these decisions trivial? How often do students get to engage in these practices? What do such practices suggest about democratic participation beyond the classroom?

6. *Should citizenship education enjoy a greater prominence in programs of study in all disciplines?*

In Alberta, the program of studies for social studies has undergone a thorough overhaul, and has embedded citizenship and identity as core concepts for the entire program from Kindergarten to grade 12. Citizenship education enjoys a prominent place in social studies, but without a greater visible presence in other disciplines, its potential impact on students may be diminished. Students need to see that there are connections across disciplinary boundaries, that citizenship is not an isolated concept, and that it is not simply something they need for the test. Its treatment as a knowledge commodity rather than a domain of practice subjects it to the possibility that the meaning and value of citizenship to students is temporary and illusory.

Sub-questions following this question involve consideration of what teachers believe should be part of citizenship education in their discipline and in other disciplines. Issues that interviewees might consider include: toleration and acceptance of differences; peace and understanding; cooperation, collaboration and community building; ethical behaviour and consideration of consequences of economic decision making; and appreciating complex systems and understanding implications of decisions on various levels of community from local to global.

7. *How prepared do you believe you are to engage in citizenship education in your discipline?*

The question was meant to elicit responses that might suggest the need to investigate whether greater pre-service and in-service preparation would be helpful to better prepare teachers for citizenship education oriented curriculum in all subject areas.

Ken Osborne writes "[t]he growing body of citizenship theory and research remains a closed book to most teachers, despite its powerful implications for education. There is a strong case for including the study of citizenship in all teacher education programmes, both pre-service and in-service, regardless of the level of subject specialty" (2005, pg. 15). Interviewees were asked about whether they see a place for pre-service and/or in-service courses that could help teachers conceive of the program of studies in their subject area as a framework for teaching for good citizenship. In addition, they were asked what might be included in such courses, and whether they believe they would have benefited from such courses.

Chapter Four

Interviews and Analysis

Citizenship Education and Curriculum

What is citizenship education, and where does it fit into the curriculum? This is the question I employed to open my dialogue with the six teachers I interviewed about a notion central to the purposes of public education. The responses I was given to this question and to subsequent questions reflect both the amorphous nature of the notion of citizenship, and an array of conceptions about the purposes and nature of curriculum and education. The teachers I interviewed often articulated responses around common themes and ambiguous terms, but further questioning revealed that these seemingly common conceptions, constructed in the language of citizenship education discourses, were constantly crosscut with diverse and complex meanings reflecting the confounding nature of the vocabulary that permeates citizenship discourses. Closer analysis reveals both concurrence and discord among the interviewees' opinions and understandings of citizenship, curriculum, and the purposes of public education, reflecting a variety of social, political, and economic agendas and backgrounds.

Each of the teachers in this study has been assigned a pseudonym reflecting their sex and gender, and reflecting the European ancestry of all of the participants. As mentioned in previous chapters, participation in this study was voluntary, and the demographic profile of the participants does not necessarily reflect the demographic profile of the faculty at the research site. Alison is an English language arts teacher in her fourth year of teaching. Beth is a science generalist who has been teaching for more than 20 years. Caroline is a career and technology studies (CTS) specialist, who also has

extensive experience in physical education, and has been teaching for more than 20 years. Diane is an English language arts teacher and reading specialist who works with ESL students, and has been teaching for more than 10 years. Alan is a social studies specialist with more than 20 years experience in the classroom, and Brad is a mathematics and science teacher, in his second year of teaching.

The conceptions of the notion of citizenship related to me by these interviewees all shared a common axis that citizenship as a practice and citizenship education both function as domains of rules and/or spaces of human-to-human and human-to-state relationships. Interestingly, all of the participants offered conceptions of citizenship and citizenship education that recognized, differentiated and favoured the 'desirable-activity' aspect over that of 'legal-status'. The distinction or conflation of these two aspects is often a source of confusion (Kymlicka & Norman, 1994). This preference of 'desirable-activity' is similar to the findings in Hughes's (1994) *Understanding Citizenship* study, where none of the participants in his study initially offered a conception of citizenship tied overtly to the notion of nation-state. This reflects one of the more troubling and confusing aspects of the language of citizenship and citizenship education – that the historically rooted relationship with nation-state and national identity and the purposing of public education to reinforce that relationship has waned. Instead, interviewees in this study offered words and phrases such as *socialization, multiculturalism, leading, mentoring, responsibility, working together, preparing for life in society* and *teaching acceptable practices and behaviours,* to describe citizenship education. Citizenship itself was described in ways that suggested it was contextual and relational, situated in time and space, and reflecting the idea that the practice of citizenship involves awareness of

others, of the world around them, and defined or revealed a framework of possibilities for interacting and cooperating with other human beings. These sorts of understandings are widely reflected in the scholarly literature in this field. Although not everyone used the term community, the relational nature of these conceptions of citizenship all offered understandings of how individuals and the community to which they belonged or identified with were connected. Two of the responses to a question concerning a personal definition the notion of citizenship reveal interesting and contrasting conceptions of citizenship, and underscore one of the most significant issues in understanding what it means to teach for good citizenship; that a universally acceptable definition of this complex normative concept, so central to the purposes of public education, is exceptionally elusive:

> Caroline: Citizenship encompasses your responsibility, your role as a contributing part of society. Not just the laws and rules and regulations that are expected of you as a citizen, the respect for others, the abiding by the law; it encompasses character and interconnectedness with other people in the community. It's making people see beyond themselves, that they are part of a bigger picture.
>
> Alan: Being able to impact your surroundings. Citizenship is having a say in our society, is being able to somehow express yourself in a meaningful way as an individual in your own circumstances and around yourself, within the community and, of course, on a national, local level. It's something that we don't engage in enough.

The former reflects conservative notions of citizenship consistent with Westheimer and Kahne's (2004) personally responsible or participatory citizenship that acknowledge and accept existing hegemonic power structures and modern nation-state systems of governance; the latter reflects to some extent, the desire to practice justice-oriented citizenship, and engage students in critical and transformative action for social change.

All of the other interviewees gave responses that fell within the range between these two conceptions; from contributing constituent to active social change agent.

In the follow-up question, I asked if citizenship was somehow different or apart from good citizenship. It was an attempt to have the interviewees each consider the possibility of difference between the legal status understanding/possession natures of citizenship, such as is the national (nation-state) sense, and the practice of good citizenship, whatever that might entail. The objective was not intended to lead the interviewees to question their initial definition, but to reflect of the broader meanings and usages of citizenship. Both Alison and Alan noted that good citizenship meant being able to recognize patterns of power and hegemony, and believed it was important to encourage students to interrogate power and authority, and act as social change agents. Alison added that she encourages students to question disproportionate distributions of power, and challenge dominant stories and narratives. According to Diane, "living in the context of a community is not the same as belonging to a community," emphasising the importance of active rather than passive citizenship, but she was not very clear on the nature of this active citizenship.

When the participants were asked to define citizenship education, most responses described a social context for the consideration of the practice of citizenship. Alison described it as socialization. Beth said that it involved "teaching, leading, mentoring, preparation for life in society, responsibility, humanitarianism." Caroline believed that citizenship "is a practice rather than a policy – connected to the hidden curriculum. It is intended to help people assimilate into Canadian society; it is multiculturalism." In this particular response Caroline recognizes that citizenship education is both overt and

covert; it is built upon practices and demonstrations of lived citizenship, but she also recognized that there are aspects of citizenship education that are less conspicuous; the hidden curriculum is assimilative, purposed with integration of the other into a dominant discourse that celebrates otherness as an interesting part of the national character, while it ensures that those being assimilated recognize that the maintenance of their distinctiveness pushes them to the periphery of the Canadian mainstream. Brad, too, offers an understanding of citizenship education that recognizes the role of the school as a venue for assimilation and integration. He responded that "citizenship education and behaviours can be recognized in the microcosm of the society that schools represent; citizenship is made up of acceptable practices and behaviours."

Does citizenship have a place in the curriculum? In responding to this question, almost all of the interviewees gave responses recognizing that citizenship is a concept that crosscuts disciplinary boundaries, or is, at least, not situated in one specific discipline or subject area. This recognition is not necessarily consistent with the perception that citizenship and citizenship education is isolated or ghettoized within social studies according to Osborne (2005), but he was almost certainly referring to official curriculum documents, as well as the rhetoric of education policymakers and administrators, rather than the practices and perceptions of teachers engaging in their professional practice. Beth noted a strong connection between biology and social studies, although she believes that it is possible to teach the other sciences without even mentioning or relating the content to concepts or issues of citizenship. This particular concern about the sciences and the possibility that these subjects can be taught without much attention to citizenship or citizenship education, especially physics and chemistry, is troubling. Olson and Lang

(2004) express concern about the absence of a citizenship literacy within the sciences. They note that there is a danger that the instrumentalist nature of some science education and the application of instrumental reasoning limit the scope and the possibility of critical citizenship by cultivating the sense that students as citizens or as citizens-to-be are cogs within the machine of science and society, and that these subjects/disciplines also cultivate the application of instrumental reasoning that constrains the parameters for the consideration of ramifications of science and its application to the measurable and quantifiable.

Caroline, Diane and Alan all stated in one way or another that curriculum is intended to connect knowledge and content with the world. Alan said "I think the curriculum should be *for* citizenship," and that "curriculums (sic) should be teaching citizenship as a part of liberation, how to be involved in society." All three recognized that the connection between the curriculum as a whole and the cultivation or production of good citizenship was a clear purpose of public education. Alison provided some of the deepest insight into this particular question. She feels that it is essential that students become aware of one of the central products or by-products of colonialism, the colonization of the mind and the acceptance of the meta-narrative that shapes and influences how we think about citizenship and the exercise of power.

> Alison: The people of a community begin to buy into their own oppression. If you're going to be part of a structure that is there for the specific socialization of the population then citizenship has to come into play. You have to look at literacy, or citizenship literacy, because there is this public discourse that goes on, there is the meta-narrative. And if you are going to become an active part of that, and especially in a democracy you need to be, you have to be literate in that meta-narrative and that discourse. Essentially what you're dealing with in curriculum is humanity, and human condition and human problems and human science and human logic. Citizenship is part of that.

This particular understanding of the role of educators in relationship to the cultivation of citizenship reflects recognition of the human dimension of citizenship and the role it plays in engaging human beings in frameworks of interaction and interdependence (Banks, 2006). In this particular response, Alison identifies a key challenge to teaching for good citizenship, that teachers in all disciplines need to be aware of and literate in the meta-narrative and hegemonic discourses that are well-concealed and embedded in the culture of education, seemingly accepted by teachers and students alike, and seldom actively interrogated or challenged in many classrooms. This challenge, referred to in Banks, is one in which he questions whether many teachers in the sciences and mathematics have the depth of understanding of their own fields to effectively engage and interrogate notions and assumptions embedded in their subjects. I do not believe that he is implying that teachers in these subject areas are lacking in depth in their subject any more than teachers in other disciplines; instead, Banks implies that in order for teachers to offer students lessons that challenge cultural assumptions, interrogate the meta-narrative and hegemonic discourses, teachers, in general, need to have a greater degree of depth of experience and understanding in the subject areas in which they teach. However, in the subject areas of mathematics and the sciences, this depth of experience and understanding needs to address universalizing discourses that create the impression that these disciplines are somehow culturally neutral.

Along with this challenge, I thought it was important to investigate whether teachers even recognized the assumptions that are commonly made about knowledge that treats Western knowledge as a body of universal truths, and marginalizes or fails to acknowledge other ways of knowing. Established curriculum and programs of study

combined with instrumentalist outcomes function as constraints or boundaries that limit the scope of what knowledge can be considered. Many teachers may be unaware that other ways of knowing exist and are as valid as Western conceptions. This lack of awareness, combined with hegemonic and Hegelian conceptions of progress and colonial modes of thinking often act to suppress the possibility that we might recognize the validity of other ways of knowing and understanding the world (Willinsky, 1998). In general, even with some explanation, interviewees had some difficulty with the idea of other ways of knowing, and many had never considered that the knowledge that each of them possesses, and the nature of how it had been constructed has been limited or constrained by deeply entrenched Western notions of knowledge. Thus, the majority had never considered that the knowledge, content and concepts they taught may not be universally accepted.

Beth, Caroline and Brad, reflecting on this reality, recognized that only Western knowledge and Western ways of knowing were privileged in school classrooms. The primary constraint that barred other ways of knowing, according to these interviewees, was the programs of study and a measurable outcomes culture.

> Beth: In some classrooms knowledge is treated as a commodity, something that [students] have to get and spit back out in the exact same form. However, some of the most radical thinkers I have encountered in education are people that are in the sciences, but they just don't have an opportunity to, because of the curriculum, confines them to deal with other issues."

Interestingly, in analysing much of the content of all of the interviews, this view that the curriculum functions to constrain dialogue rather than encourage it, occurs again and again. Curriculum, overtly and covertly through its tacit acceptance by teachers, students, and the community-at-large, constrains free and democratic discussion of ideas,

restricting the dialogue to accepted and acceptable Western knowledge discourses. On top of this, programs of study and the curriculum in general were perceived and accepted by most interviewees as the end goal of teaching, rather than as a starting-point or a foundation for building.

With consideration to the acknowledgement that citizenship education crosses subject area boundaries, and is certainly embedded in the intentions of the curriculum, I asked the interviewees to describe the skills, abilities and attitudes of good citizenship that students should be learning in the classroom, and in schools. Most identified critical thinking and problem-solving skills as essential. Alison believed that the role of teachers and schools was to create or cultivate among students a critical awareness of the dialogue that is going on around them.

> Alison: [Teachers] need to give them the skills they need to critique, so they are actively involved in that dialogue and not passively consuming it. And I think that the battle we have, especially with the current generation, is that there is a tendency towards passive consumption because it is easy.

Alison's emphasis on the importance of teaching the skills of critique was a theme that ran through most her responses in her interview, and strongly reflected how she believed citizenship education fits in with the English language arts program and the curriculum as a whole. Certainly, the cultivation of skills and abilities related to critique and critical awareness of the political nature of text are an important citizenship attribute. When these skills are employed by students, they help them to interrogate, challenge and appreciate that the media the students are exposed to when they read, listen and see, articulate or reflect agendas that may be concealed below the surface, hidden between the lines of text or embedded in the form of subliminal messages in music and visual media.

Beth emphasized the importance of problem solving, looking at the bigger picture, and considering other points of view. Caroline talked about respect and responsibility and "knowing their rights and responsibilities as citizens – and many don't." Student need to know "what that means to them, and what they need to be doing." And, Brad discussed the importance of learning about other cultures and effective communication. All of these points imply the critical and relational aspects of citizenship, the existence of otherness, and acknowledge the importance of dialogue with and consideration of others. Diane put it best among these interviewees in characterizing the role of overt and hidden curricula in helping student shape their own sense of citizenship.

> Diane: [Students] need to learn to be accepting of people. They need to learn to work with people they don't particularly like and in a way that shows, maybe, respect – to be a good citizen. They would need to be able to know the difference between compromising and cooperating. They would also need to know how to set boundaries or limits to what they are willing or not willing to do within a situation.

This particular response reflects the challenge of preparing students to live in a diverse, complex, and Western liberal democratic space. The objective of fostering an environment where cooperation and compromise and other such negotiated outcomes is especially challenging to teachers, scholars, policy makers and curriculum designers, because the message is seemingly contradicted in other public spaces that encourage selfish consumption, personal autonomy and self-interest over community-building and problem solving.

Most of the interviewees noted how difficult it is to teach a sense of community, responsibility, problem solving and the consequences of consumption when the schools themselves were sites of conflicting interests and messages. Alison pointed out the

power of corporatism; advertising and brand loyalty within schools. This is most visible, not necessarily just in the vending machines in schools, but in the limited number of calculator models students can choose from because of their compatibility with mathematics workbooks and with the program of studies. She also expressed concern over the choices of computer hardware and software used in schools and the influence these have in shaping the delivery of any technology-related or technology-driven outcomes.

Thus, it is essential to cultivate among teachers a critical awareness of the corporate relationships that permeate education and other institutions in the public sphere (McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2005). Such assumptions about the appropriateness of marketing and advertising in subtle and sublime ways is so pervasive that both students and teachers fail to recognizes its ubiquity and its permeation into public education domains from supplies that students need, to product placements in videos and movies that are used in the classroom, to advertising in search engines and *educational* sites on the internet. Alison emphasized the importance of teachers being able to help student recognize these embedded and privileged structures of power in our society. She states that teachers have a responsibility to "let students know that there are guys in suits sitting around a table figuring this stuff out."

In addition, Beth noted that instrumentalist goals and neo-liberal objectives often get in the way of efforts to foster a sense of community and engage in the practice of good citizenship pedagogy. She believes that most teachers recognize the importance of teaching for critical consumption as an important element of teaching for citizenship, but teachers also get "so final exam-oriented that the really important stuff gets missed for

the sake of performance." This is reinforced by Caroline who expressed her concern that programs of study are treated as prescriptive, acting to limit or stifle critical thinking and meaningful engagement, while simultaneously emphasizing their importance in the front-matter of curriculum documents.

> Caroline: I hate to say this, but sometime I feel that teachers are so restricted by the curriculum that they don't have the opportunity to build on what is truly necessary, unless it is a specific class on citizenship… I don't have the room to teach anything else. And if it's not embedded in the curriculum, it's not being taught."

Although all of the participants agreed that teaching students to be critical consumers of both the products they buy and the knowledge and information they consume, the message that the participants say is being delivered is insufficient, inconsistent, and not sufficiently supported in programs of study.

Interviewees told me that teachers could do a better job of encouraging activism among students and within the teaching community. By activism I meant encouraging students to take a more active role in their communities from local through global levels; this activism can range from writing letters to becoming much more deeply involved in community, national and international organizations and endeavours. But encouraging activism means ensuring that students have the tools and opportunity to be engaged. Embedded forces and tensions limit opportunities for some students to pursue activism, while encouraging others. The literature suggests that the division of opportunity for activism often manifests itself between different academic streams (Osborne, 1997). This is to some extent reinforced by the response of Alison who responded that students who were subject to limited economic opportunities, and have a dangerous home life, may have little opportunity or desire to engage in the practice of activist citizenship. These

students are often the ones who make up the lower streams. Alison states that students who are struggling to meet core curriculum expectations are not likely to seek opportunities for community involvement. Diane and Brad suggested that only those students who are self-assertive tend to be encouraged by teachers to be active. The message is that activism is a choice, and choosing passive participation and acceptance of the status quo is not only acceptable, but often encouraged by a hidden curriculum that cultivates a culture of compliance among students and teachers by engaging in assessment strategies that devalue outcomes that are difficult to measure. Alan, a social studies teacher, emphasises the importance of activism to all of his students and uses his own participation in a variety of organizations and movements as an example. "In my own classes I encourage all of them to be activists. But I know from watching other teachers and even teachers in my own discipline that the message of activism is missing."

Teaching, Community, and Practice

When I asked about how events within the range of community from local to global impact teaching practice, most interviewees said they try to bring current events into the classroom to make lessons more meaningful. All of them acknowledged the complexity of the world in which we live, and only one expressed real reservations about spending time discussing political issues in class. Brad, the youngest of the participants, and the teacher with the least classroom experience among those interviewed, told me that he avoided getting into political discussions with his students for fear that his position of authority transformed his opinions into a form of indoctrination because teachers are in the position of assumed-to-know. Most other interviewees suggested that current events and topical issues provided opportunities for teaching moments, and for

engaging the students in recognizing the relationships between people, communities and governments. Alison's response challenged the notion that teachers can or should try to be neutral entities that reserve their opinions.

> Alison: It is impossible to separate who you are as a teacher from who you are outside of the classroom. Beyond the stuff that connects to text, what I do everyday is come to work and engage in a dialogue with a group of people that have to listen to me. When I am out in the world and I get excited about something, I bring that in here because I want to talk to people about it; that's what we are her to do.

She told me that she shares her position on issues with her students, but the condition of sharing is that her opinion or position is open to be questioned and challenged. She describes herself as the most experienced learner in class, acknowledging the influence of Freire (1994), in articulating a reciprocal relationship between teachers and students.

Shaping of Citizenship

Interviewees provided a range of sources they believe shape and continue to influence their own personal perception of citizenship. Place and time played a major role in a number of the responses, as did family, religious institutions, and schools, although the influence that school had on two of the three interviewees that mentioned them, came as part of their teaching practice, rather than their experience as students. Those responses where schools played a role in shaping these teachers' sense of citizenship are consistent with the literature that identifies a range of sites of citizenship learning, including family, religious institutions, schools and the media (Callan, 1997; Strike, 1998). Schools just happen to be the one site most clearly situated in the public domain, and most easily subject to political influence, manoeuvring and rhetoric, especially through the control of public education funding.

Each interviewee's response had a distinctive character that strongly suggested that a wide range of potential forces play a role in shaping conceptions of citizenship. Although place and time were the most common domains of reference, the roles that specific places and times played in shaping each interviewees sense of citizenship were quite diverse. Beth travelled a great deal as a child, and went to school in the Caribbean, Britain and Atlantic Canada. Her European ancestry made her a member of a privileged although visible minority on the Caribbean island on which grew up, and her sense of minority status has stuck with her since she self-identifies as a member of the gay, lesbian, transsexual and bisexual (GLTB) community, although she doesn't directly come out to her students in class.

> Beth : … I belong to the GLTB community in Edmonton, and as a gay woman and as an educator who has been out for a long time, I live in a culture that is quite oppressive and homophobic toward GLTB individuals, and therefore I am incredibly sensitive about that with my students. I don't come out in class, it's kind of a non-issue. And yet, I have rainbow flags in the classroom and if people know what it means, they come to me. I don't have to say a thing. They automatically come, and they often don't come out and say anything about 'I know what that means', but they make very specific comments about how their sister or brother or cousin has a rainbow flag and they totally get what that means.

For Beth, the transition in minority status from visible to invisible has played a significant role in shaping her identity and sense of citizenship. Official curricula still marginalize issues related to GLTB lifestyles and anti-GLTB discourses; this is reinforced by a heteronormative hidden curriculum (Macintosh & Loutzenheiser, 2006). She expressed unease concerning the willingness and ease at which many people in the GLTB community practice universalized citizenship behaviours that conceal their marginalized identities, recognizing that such practices actually operate to deny GLTB community members their full rights and opportunities as citizens. She told me that

Canada lends itself to easy assimilation for members of some minority groups, and that it is easy to adopt hegemonic values and lifestyle, and to lose your own identity.

Caroline and Brad both mentioned that they grew up in small towns in Alberta, and the scale of community combined with small town values, and close relationships with parents and extended families played a role in shaping their personal sense of citizenship. For Caroline, this environment influenced her belief in the close relationship between character education and citizenship. She emphasized that in such a small community everyone knew everyone else, and people felt more responsible and accountable to each other than they might in a larger urban community.

> Caroline: You are friends with everybody, you know everybody, you connect with everybody; you don't always think of doing something bad because it is going to be in the paper the next day. Even skipping classes; whether it's right or wrong, you don't skip because there is only one restaurant to go to and you know your grandpa is going to be sitting there having coffee.

Brad was the youngest of the interviewees, and the only one other than Caroline to include family amongst the influences that shaped his notion of citizenship.

> Brad: I would actually say that school is lower on my list because I had a good family and a good upbringing… I mean you spend the first five years without school and that's when you become the person that you are, right. Although at school the teachers correct you, right from wrong, I think for the most part that your parents should have taught you those things before.

Alan's sense of citizenship and emphasis on activism and active participation in the community and in political processes came out of experiences from his childhood. He explained that "growing up in a poor part of Little Italy, watching kids going through garbage cans picking up excess lunches from schoolyards has taught me a lot about what it means to be involved in the community." He expressed a concern about the forces that are actively acting on our collective sense of citizenship by discouraging active

participation in the community, limiting access to democratic processes that make access to information prohibitive or at least, and by paying little more than lip-service to representative democracy.

> Alan: Over time, what I've seen is the citizen has become diminished... We are encouraged to withdraw from more active citizenship, into a more passive role as producer and consumer... You can see that the Alberta Legislature will sit less than 50 days this year (2005-2006), and they will make multi-billion dollar decisions without having to justify any of that to the public... I'm not, as a citizen, allowed to participate in that... I can rally behind it, and I would probably be invited to join the group [of supporters], but if I say it is the wrong move – that doesn't matter.

According to Alan, the only space in the public domain that remains open to democratic choice is the marketplace of goods and services. This process of diminishing the place of public space as a venue for active political dialogue, and its repurposing as a place primarily for marketing and entrepreneurship, frustrates efforts to actively engage students and other members of their society in meaningful community building activities.

Alison found it difficult to isolate or identify specific places or events that shape or have shaped her understanding of the notion of citizenship, but she does offer an insight into recursive processes in English/language arts that are intended to help students develop and reinforce their own conceptions of citizenship through dialogue and through engaging with literature and other forms of media. While the other interviewees offered familiar spatial and temporal settings for the development of their understandings of citizenship, Alison's conception is situated in language, text and dialogue. Although almost all of the interviewees suggested that their conceptions of citizenship were dynamic, and evolving; Alison was the only one to locate her understanding of citizenship in a clearly hermeneutic space.

> Alison: There's a kind of understanding that is embedded in our curriculum that language arts is recursive and reciprocal and I see language as a site for change – particularly with regards to text and the nature of text right now with modernity and society. That is the key site for change. I think that my citizenship is still evolving, still changing. The idea of what it is, isn't going to stop, just like my idea of language and text isn't going to stop growing and changing because language itself is growing and changing constantly. And if I am truly engaged in that process I can't say I'm done, ever.

Only Caroline suggested that her conception of citizenship has remained relatively stable and static; this contrast within such a small sample of teachers in one high school reveals a potential space for investigating whether students recognize that they are potentially exposed to contrasting messages in schools about what it means to understand and practice citizenship. Following from this is the issue of the extent to which students believe such contrasting messages contribute to their own understanding and/or misunderstanding about the nature and practice of citizenship.

Citizenship and Subject Area

Few interviewees were able to identify to me specific, overt citizenship related outcomes in their particular subject areas. How, then, might teachers confront and address the challenge or burden of ensuring that curricula within their classrooms and within the school contribute to the development of *good citizens*? And, with very diverse understandings of how a sense of citizenship is developed, and even what constitutes *good* citizenship, how might such a range of conceptions be manifested in the classroom?

All of the interviewees were able to identify some elements of their particular subject specialties that had a citizenship dimension, or had the potential for a citizenship dimension, but did not believe that the program of studies in their particular subject area articulated any overt or clearly recognizable citizenship education outcomes. Thus, with a limited time to consider the question, all of the interviewees recognized that the

responsibility for shaping and incorporating citizenship related outcomes depended heavily on their own ability to identify spaces of possibility within their own subject areas, and their own ability to develop citizenship related lessons and units that could take advantage of those spaces. Although all of them concurred on the belief that each of them was a citizenship educator, and recognized that the onus was on each of them to develop and incorporate citizenship education outcomes, each recognized that the subject areas that they taught offered different types of conditions and challenges to developing and incorporating such outcomes.

Both Alison and Diane identified their subject areas as settings for open dialogue. Alison notes that her English 30-1 (academic stream) course is constructed around story-telling, and the role stories play in helping human beings to shape their identities, and in understanding, questioning, shaping and changing the world. "The stories are representative of who we've been and who we could be, and they are critical of us, and [stories are] kind of a safe place where we can play at our own humanity." Because this course is mandatory for students who intend to pursue a university degree after high school, and because the setting of this particular school is in a large urban area, the course offers a venue for conveying notions of identity among and between students of diverse cultural and ethnic backgrounds.

Yet that diversity is reflected in different ways in other classrooms. Beth noted the difference in the demographics in each of the science courses she teaches. In biology, which she described as a good setting for engaging dialogue around citizenship related outcomes, the classes are largely made up of students of European descent with more female students than male. In chemistry and physics, there are a larger number of

students belonging to *visible minorities*, with more male students than female, especially in physics. According to Beth, both chemistry and physics could be taught without giving much attention to making connections between specified outcomes in the program of studies and citizenship education outcomes not specifically mentioned in the program of studies, especially at the grade 12 level.

Like Beth, Brad has difficulty thinking of mathematics and some of the sciences as venues for overt citizenship education, although he does see connections between biology and citizenship. He sees the outcomes in the program of studies in mathematics as intended to help students prepare themselves for the workforce and for jobs and post-secondary programs that require advanced numeracy, but he does not necessarily see the connection between these outcomes and teaching for good citizenship, although he did say that the focus on problem-solving was related to citizenship. Caroline also related citizenship education in her classroom and in the subject areas in which she has taught to preparing students for the world of work. She told me she helps students understand the types of interactions they will encounter and engage in with employers.

In describing social studies, Alan said "responsible citizenship is our subject," although he says the program of studies for social studies steers away from actually defining it. Alan says that "You're supposed to glean that from the curriculum. Kids should be aware of their political, their social, and their economic condition and somehow this will manifest itself into what is known as a citizen." He says the program of studies asks teachers to encourage students to become active and informed citizens, although he believes that the structure of the program has a hidden curricular agenda that informed and participatory citizenship has its limits and constraints, and that policy-

makers and those exercising power in our society want informed citizens, "not too informed – but informed enough to function within our society." Yet, in spite of hidden curriculum constraints, Alan recognizes the importance of being a citizenship educator, although he does not think that institutionally it is actually the highest ranked priority.

> Alan: I've always considered my job in social studies, that we have a job of making people more powerful, or really trying to give them the tools that can shape their own and other's destinies. If they walk out of my classroom going 'I never thought about it that way before,' or 'that's a different way of looking at it,' then I know I've done citizenship education. This means that simply delivering or covering content for the sake of meeting some prescriptive understanding of curriculum is not in itself citizenship education, but it has to be a bit more. It has to elevate the discourse beyond the information in the text being used. It has to engage the students and it needs to encourage students to appreciate that the issues discussed [in class] are larger in scope than their own perspectives.

Understandings of the need to consider alternative perspectives came up in a number of interviews, and reflect an interesting and challenging aspect of the new social studies program in Alberta. According to interviewees, opportunities to understand other perspectives and engage in discussion seems to occur most in English language arts and social studies, and to an extent in biology more than the other sciences or mathematics. Some interviewees also saw opportunities to engage in such discussions in CALM (Career and Life Management), a mandatory course required to qualify for a high school diploma in Alberta.

When asked whether citizenship education concepts are clearly reflected in the program of studies in their discipline or subject area, none of the interviewees could identify or recall specific instances that could be described as articulating a clear citizenship education-related notion or concept. Even Alan, who teaches social studies, found the treatment of the concept of citizenship within the current program of studies as evasive and ambiguous. He says "they skirt around the actual notions of citizenship

when they have to deal with the government and how a bill is passed, but I've never entered into a conversation where you pick something meaningful for you [the student] and write a letter to your MP about it or to your MLA."

Beth was able to identify a lot of possibilities for spaces to discuss issues that had citizenship dimensions, but these dimensions had to be identified by the teacher and were not necessarily spelled out in official curriculum documents. She noted that the place of STS (Science, Technology and Society) within all three science programs certainly implied citizenship related outcomes, including responsible energy consumption, responsibility for the environment and issues of medical ethics, especially in the areas of genetics and reproduction, however she did not recall whether the term, 'citizenship,' actually was in the language of the program of studies in biology, chemistry or physics.

Alison returned to critical reading and the recursive nature of the English language arts program, discussing the notion that texts operate as a medium to understand humanness and humanity. Texts need to help students make connections with the real world, and students need to perceive them as relevant.

> Alison: Within the curriculum itself, one of the things I talk to my kids about is why they are here is to improve the way they communicate and engage in the world… There are two parts to that: There's the ability to take in and understand and interpret the stories that are circulating around us, and the other part is being able to articulate your own ideas and thoughts and impact the stories as they go back out, because you are more than a passive filter – you need to be actively changing the world around you, and the way you do that is through language.

By engaging her students in developing a literacy around the complexity of human experience, and the diversity of stories, not simply by encountering such narratives but by contributing to them critically, and creatively, Alison is helps her students develop a

literacy in citizenship that is similar to citizenship literacies alluded to in Hughes's Delphi study (1994) and in Banks (2006).

If the production of good citizens is the generally accepted goal of citizenship education, but does not seem to be clearly articulated in programs of study, I was curious whether interviewees perceived that a gap existed between the rhetoric of citizenship education as a domain of policy, and the practice of citizenship education in classrooms. Several of the interviewees identified management paradigms at the district and provincial levels that valued measurable outcomes primarily, and citizenship related outcomes were deemed difficult to measure. Alison noted that there was likely a disconnect between policy makers and the people drawing up programs of study.

> Alison: The people who are coming to the table to produce the curriculum are probably very clear about what they are doing. I have little doubt that whether or not they name it, citizenship education comes into the development of that curriculum. The people who are setting up the funding models, the standards of excellence, the assessment model, those people are not necessarily coming from the same place [as the curriculum design people] and they are not necessarily interested in it, because what they are interested in is results based management in achievement, in how do I account for every single penny that is given to a school?

This brings up an interesting issue worth investigating, but beyond the scope of this particular study. How do education policy makers understand the notion of citizenship, and whether the perceived disparity suggested by interviewees between educators, curriculum designers and education policy makers actually exists. Diane noted that the concept of citizenship, when it does appear in curricular documents, and when it is referred to by policymakers in the media seems highly idealized and constrained. This suggests the possibility that education policymakers may be working with a more rigid, positivist notion of citizenship. According to Bassey (1999), the public domain is positivist, but the private is interpretive. Thus what might be articulated

in the public sphere as the official objective of citizenship education may actually be perceived by the audience of teachers and members of the public as empty or ideologically-driven rhetoric for public consumption, and the difference in understanding between public articulation and the notion of citizenship education in individual teaching practice is implicitly acknowledged.

Are the intentions of curriculum designers lost or displaced by the rhetorical power of policymakers? Do teachers feel confused or trapped between what might be implied in the wording of official curriculum document, the rhetoric of policymakers, the time constraints of the school year, and the expectations of students, their parents, and the community-at-large? Might teachers recognize this as an opening into a flexible space to negotiate their own conception of citizenship in the context of education, and try to engage that conception in their teaching practice?

The challenge for teachers in such circumstances is to try to make effort to expand the dialogue and broaden the scope of citizenship education and dialogue with students, pushing the envelope beyond status quo conceptions of citizenship. Interviewees offered a number of possible ways to expand and incorporate a more prominent role for citizenship education in their own subject areas. Among these, Beth believes that there should be more opportunities to incorporate cross-disciplinary collaborations to address complex and controversial subjects.

> Beth: Teachers could get together and brainstorm about some of the controversial topics that are out there, that are in popular culture, and find ways of pulling those topics into class so students can speak about them in the context of the curriculum, and listen to other people's perspectives in the context of popular culture, and explore how different cultures look at these issues.

This kind of collaborative effort between different subject areas allows students and teachers to explore multiple dimensions of complex issues that they might not have been able to cover or give sufficient attention within the context of their own subject area. It also offers a learning opportunity for all participants, both students and teachers, on how different cultural, ethnic, religious and socio-economic groups understand and perceive priorities, and might even offer opportunities to explore and engage post-colonial world challenges about priorities and possibilities for addressing complex issues set in non-Western contexts.

Participant responses to this question offered a good opportunity to ask a question about whether issues related to globalization come up in the classroom. Globalization is a multifaceted concept, and a wide range of definitions and conceptions exist that are ideologically loaded, and reflect a complex array of economic, political and social changes that have transformed human interactions since the late 1980s (Held et al., 2000; Rizvi, 2004; Smith, 2006). David Smith wrote that even the concept of globalization as we might understand it currently is little more than a decade old. Its currency within the academy and within curriculum reflects its importance as a domain worthy of significant pedagogical attention. In Alberta, for example, both streams of the new Social Studies 10 program focus on questions that ask whether we should embrace globalization and the extent to which it should be embraced(Alberta Education., 2005). Its currency and it relationship to issues related to sovereignty, the nature of community, responsibility, accountability and the relevance of nation-states and the role of supra-national entities, transnational corporations, and NGOs, links discussion of globalization intrinsically with citizenship and citizenship education.

But its currency, combined with the time it takes to draft and implement program changes at the provincial level, means that the onus has been on teachers to find a space for dialogue on globalization on their own, for some time. All of the participants acknowledged that issues related to their understanding of globalization had come up in their classrooms. Beth, for example, encourages students to recognize that many of the issues and problems that confront human communities do not recognize borders or sovereignty, not can they be resolved by a patchwork of international initiatives.

> Beth: When I think of globalization I think of citizenship of the entire world. It can come up in science classes by looking at the pollution problem and the fact that you can't clean up the air in Canada without cleaning up the air in the entire world… I always use the example of a non-smoking area in a restaurant; it's like having a no-peeing section in a [swimming] pool, it's ridiculous"

Diane recognizes that a further dimension is that engaging in a dialogue about globalization – that the term itself, along with a collection of other normative terms employed in such dialogue are shaped by cultural, linguistic, geographic, chronologic and ideological forces, and by individual and group experiences.

> Diane: There are kids in this classroom who have sat on boards in front of people and discussed peace and how they thought peace would occur, and they're from Africa, so they have a different understanding of what peace is, especially from their experience. So to hear them talk about what they did and what they brought up was very interesting, and I think because the kids are allowed their discussion time [in this class] it makes it a bit easier to mention things like that. So there is an amazing amount of world knowledge in this building because of where all of these kids come from.

Democratic Classrooms

In its legal sense, citizenship is often understood in the context of defining the nature of the reciprocal obligations in the relationship between citizen and state, and between citizens within the public domain. Such conceptions of citizenship establish parameters for the rule-bound spaces in which we live and interact. In this context, we

have become so accustomed to implied rules of these relationships, that we seldom question or interrogate them, and we further assume their universality, that human beings accept these conditions as normal. This conception of rule-bound spaces extends to schools and classrooms where their implicit acceptance by teachers and students establishes a regime of acceptable behaviours, and dictates the nature of classroom conduct and management. All of the interviewees seemed to accept this particular regime, and all of them associated it with certain behaviours and conditions that they all classified as democratic. These always included that all members of the classroom community felt safe, and this safety came with inherent limitations, especially on speech; the freedom to be safe from harmful and hurtful speech, and the opportunity to speak free from the intimidation of others. In addition, most of the interviewees characterized this democratic environment as one that permits some degree of participation in decision-making, but ultimately leaves final decision-making power in the hands of the teacher. In certain respects, this model reflects some of the most common liberal-democratic notions of consensus-making and consensus-building communities (Callan, 1997, 2004; Strike, 1998).

All of the interviewees recognized the importance of modelling good citizenship behaviours, and all believed that students emulated these modelled behaviours to some extent; this is important to note, because while some teachers modelled activism, several interviewees also noted that students recognize that passive acceptance of the status quo and apathy are also acceptable forms of participation. In addition, both Beth and Alan mentioned that students recognize hypocrisy in teaching practice and the modelling of good citizenship behaviours, noting when teachers advocate active citizenship yet

seemingly practice passive or apathetic forms of citizenship. Yet classrooms and schools are not necessarily good analogues for modelling democratic behaviour, unless both teachers and students interrogate and understand the nature of social order that exists in these settings and recognize the degree to which they reflect or fail to reflect the democratic public spaces in which they are situated.

Teachers are the final decision-makers in classrooms. They are not elected, they are not necessarily representative of the demographic in the classroom, and they are not solely accountable to the students whom they teach, but to a superstructure of management who have a contractual relationship with the teacher. This superstructure has the power to change the teacher's assignment and working conditions. The students, for the most part, have limited choice as to whether they attend school, and who will teach them. Although, like the surrounding community, they may have little choice as to whom their neighbours are, they are generally grouped together in a similar age cohort. In addition, they may have little influence on the content of the courses they are taking, or the means by which their success will be measured. In circumstances where they do get input into classroom decisions, choices are limited, and the associated discussion and decision process are constrained in their scope and in the time allotted for democratic processes to take place. According to most of the interviewees, students are often allowed to choose the date for exams from a very limited list of choices, and all decisions of greater consequence are left in the hands of the teacher, department heads, and school and district administration.

According to interviewees, in many of their classrooms, students establish the rules of conduct themselves, and according to Caroline may impose systems of rules with

more limited latitude and flexibility than rules imposed by teachers. The challenge that many of the interviewees noted was that students, even in the higher grades, still had difficulty making the distinction between equality and fairness, a distinction that citizens in diverse democratic communities also find quite contentious (Callan, 1997; Kymlicka, 1995, 2001). This challenge that confronts diverse communities has an analogue in classroom management according to Beth. She expressed concern that students and teachers recognize and acknowledge that obstacles to equality need to be addressed to ensure fairness in the classroom, but certain kinds of disparities are privileged and entitled to this consideration, and others still need to be confronted and remedied.

> Beth: When you have scenarios where, for example, GLTB youth experience intense homophobia in the classroom as a result of a teacher not calling on a student making anti-gay or homophobic comments in class, I think it's our responsibility to jump on in that class and to ensure that [students and teachers recognize that] those things are hurtful to people, just like racist comments. But, I think racism is much more dealt with, that we deal with racism better, in a more efficient way than we deal with homophobia.

Passive acceptance by teachers and administrators of homophobic speech and behaviours offers a model to students that society in general gives sanction to heteronormative distinctions concerning gender and sex, differentiating homophobia from other less acceptable forms of discrimination (Macintosh & Loutzenheiser, 2006).

Citizenship Education and Reflective Practice

The last set of questions I asked interviewees concerned ways in which citizenship education could enjoy greater prominence in programs of study across all subject areas. Most interviewees again noted that they were unaware of overt references to the development of good citizenship as a purpose or as a set of related outcomes within the program of studies in the subject areas that they taught. The only exception was

social studies, and in that subject and in all other subjects, Alan emphasized the importance and necessity that the notion of citizenship embedded in curriculum has to "mean something." "… I think it needs to be pervasive in all curriculums (sic). Science, what are we doing, why do we discover, what is the purpose of that, what the humanity of humanities without knowing our place in it, and what can we do." Most interviewees believe that it should be visible everywhere in the curriculum, and that it needs to be part of the discourse in both teaching and teacher training. Caroline, in particular, advocated the need for citizenship education outcomes to be clearly articulate in programs of study, and for teachers to be better acquainted with learning outcomes in other subject areas. "Character education, citizenship education, to help train teachers how to walk the talk a little bit better. How to say it, how to speak the language."

Interviewees were asked if they believed that teachers might benefit from additional training or in-service courses that could assist them in developing ideas, lessons and materials to support the integration of more overt citizenship education outcomes. Without any specifics of what this might entail, all but one of the interviewees agreed on the usefulness of such support for practicing teachers, and all agreed on the need to integrate such a course into teacher training programs.

Several suggested that integrating citizenship education training needs to be done carefully to complement reflective practice, and one interviewee expressed concern that careless implementation might be perceived as a criticism of a currents teaching practice. The intention of such a program should be to guide teaching, encourage risk-taking and foster and intensify dialogue around citizenship and citizenship education discourses in classrooms, school, and in the communities in which these are situated.

Teachers as Citizenship Educators

It is interesting to note that although all of the interviewees seem to recognize the importance of their role as citizenship educators, regardless of what they thought teaching for good citizenship was, so few of them attributed their own sense of citizenship to their own experience as public school students. With both overt and hidden curricula for good citizenship operating with concurrent and sometimes contrary purposes, can teachers recognize and achieve their potential as agents of change, to expand the notions of citizenship and good citizenship, while still remaining and serving as paid agents of institutions that are purposed with maintaining the status quo?

The teachers I interviewed acknowledged many of the challenges that they face in trying to prepare students as citizens and citizens-to-be, and they revealed many of the institutionalized impediments that act to constrain the role of teacher as citizenship educator. Teachers need to be able to help students contend with globalizing forces in domains from communication, trade and employment to ecological strains on humanity, the natural world, and the planet. They must be prepared to guide students to work on addressing disparities posed by affluence and poverty, mass-consumption economies and limited resources, and, teachers must be able to help students develop and deploy tools to address these challenges in a world where they combine and interact in complex networks of tensions that stress and distress the natures of citizenship and good citizenship. In addition, teachers, themselves, must contend with institutionalized management paradigms that privilege easily measurable outcomes over those that might truly foster good citizenship and social justice, because the latter outcomes cannot be easily quantified. Further, they also contend with resistance from students, policy makers

and members of the community-at-large, that despite rhetoric to the contrary, cultivate apathy and acceptance of the status quo.

In general, the interviewees all believed that they were citizenship educators and believed that teachers and schools play important roles in cultivating good citizenship in spite of their own experiences as students. The diverse conceptions that these teachers offered concerning the nature of citizenship education and education for good citizenship suggest that both of these are spaces of possibility worthy of further exploration, and that there is substantial potential to engage teachers and their students in processes that broaden and deepen what it means to understand and practice good citizenship.

Chapter Five

Insights and Possibilities

As I enter the concluding chapter of my MEd thesis, I have just begun to get some insight into how this group of teachers understands citizenship and what it might mean to teach for good citizenship. What is both encouraging and a bit disturbing is the degree to which it was possible to engage in a series of discussions about a topic central to the purposes of public education, without necessarily agreeing on the definition or even the intention and nature of one of the key terms. From a theoretical and hermeneutic perspective, this acknowledges a space for possibilities of meaning, and an acknowledgement that there are a range of forces at work that contribute to the continuing evolution and transformation of a concept like citizenship. From a legalistic and positivist perspective, such a degree of ambiguity and amorphousness in the language of the discourse is troubling; it means that it may be challenging and frustrating to continually renegotiate purposeful and meaningful understandings and objectives of citizenship on an ongoing basis, and failure to overcome such a limitation inevitably delimits, constrains and even confounds what it means to teach and practice good citizenship. Such limitations and challenges have the potential to allow policy makers and others in positions of power and influence to apply pressure to constrain the nature of citizenship education and education for good citizenship; but the same opening also presents both a challenge and an opportunity for teachers, teacher educators and education scholars to continue to expand, explore and reveal the complex topography of citizenship.

At the end of the second chapter of this thesis I asked the following question: Are teachers, in their role of educators for good citizenship, succeeding in confronting the challenge of trying to capture some of the essential substance of citizenship while simultaneously considering and reflecting on how the changes that are occurring in those communities are impacting and transforming the nature of citizenship for themselves, their students, and for human beings all over the world? Based on the very small scope of this study, I can say that among the teachers I spoke with, the answer to the question is that they are partially succeeding. As a small scale qualitative inquiry, this study has some potential to offer insights that may be generalizable to the larger population of teachers in the city in which the study was situated, and to a more limited extent to public high schools in other larger urban settings in English speaking parts of Canada.

The varied nature of responses to the questions I posed to interviewees suggested that the notions of citizenship and citizenship education carry with them a range of meanings, purposes and possibilities, and that the forces, tensions and influences that have shaped and continue to shape each interviewee's understanding and practice of teaching for good citizenship continues to change and evolve, whether they recognize that change is taking place or not.

The practice of both citizenship and citizenship education, according to the teachers I interviewed, is predominantly concerned with manners and ways of being in the world and of interacting with other human beings more than it is a domain or set of allegiances or parameters defining the relationship between individual and state. This might suggest that it is the relationships between individuals and nation-states which are so deeply entrenched and ubiquitous in our own identities that we might fail to be able to

identify them or recognize how we think of ourselves as citizens. Without prompting, only Alan, a social studies teacher, mentioned voting as a part of the practice of citizenship, and both Caroline and Brad mentioned that good citizenship was associated with obeying the law. Most of the responses described citizenship as a domain of human to human interactions, mostly in immediate communities in which the teachers and their students are situated, but there is certainly some awareness that citizenship stretches significantly beyond the boundaries of the classroom and the school. For example, Beth, a science teacher, sees a direct connection between pollution, citizenship and nation-states. She helps her students to appreciate that pollution, like many other types of human activity, has an impact on the environment – the air, the planet and people – and that the movement of matter in the air occurs without regard to national boundaries.

Alison and Alan emphasized the importance of helping students to recognize that conservative hegemonic forces employ citizenship in a manner intended to maintain the status quo, and Alison further recognized that all teachers, regardless of discipline, need to be aware of and literate in the meta-narratives that permeate citizenship discourses in the public domain. This literacy requires that teachers appreciate some of the complexity of citizenship and citizenship education that is otherwise concealed within the hidden curricular aims of public education. In addition, regardless of subject area, teachers need to be well acquainted with the discourses of assimilation, compliance and control that along with the freedom of the marketplace are deeply embedded in the institutional structure of schools and curriculum, so that they are able to help raise students' awareness of the influence of these discourses (Banks, 2006; McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2005; Olson & Lang, 2004). Does the failure of teachers to fully

recognize the presence of such discourses within hidden and written curricula suggest a failure or deficiency in teacher training, ongoing professional development and reflective practice? Is such a form of literacy in meta-narratives something that teachers can learn, practice and share with their students? Following from this question is the issue of determining responsibility for defining what it is to be literate in these meta-narratives and determining how such literacy training is delivered to teachers.

Diane noted the difficulty posed by language of citizenship discourses, especially in a diverse community. Meanings are complex, shaped by factors such as individual experience, cultural and religious values, ideological orientation, as well as socioeconomic status (Schwandt, 2000). In a school where a large number of students are not of European descent and come from lower socioeconomic strata, this presents a challenge to teachers who are largely of European descent and of socioeconomic middle-class status. This is especially the case in discussing concepts such as peace, prosperity, racism, discrimination, equitable access to resources and, of course, the practice of citizenship with their students. The teachers who participated in this study all recognized to varying degrees that the notion of citizenship is difficult to grasp and articulate and that it changes from setting to setting and from situation to situation.

The language of citizenship can operate as both a space of opportunity for exploring the possibilities of citizenship or a fortress, giving the illusion of protection to its inhabitants from current local, global and post-nation-state tensions and forces that bombard its modernist defences. Citizenship's malleability and amorphousness can allow for broader, deeper and dynamic understandings of citizenship and what it means to teach for good citizenship; however, it has the potential to function as a fortress for those

educators who are less at ease with citizenship as amorphous, evolving and dynamic, and more comfortable with a limited sense of what it means to teach for and practice good citizenship, especially if such teachers are seemingly content with conservative notions of citizenship, or just ambivalent about stretching the meaning of citizenship or considering its possibilities. The teachers I spoke with are all situated in places between the spaces of opportunity and the fortress of ambivalence. They believe they are all working in some way to encourage students to become active members of the communities to which they belong and to engage in the practices of good citizenship. However, these educators feel institutional pressure from overt and hidden curricular sources that limit the opportunities for themselves and their students to more deeply engage and interrogate current citizenship discourses.

Differences and Reconciliation

Interestingly, there was a noticeable difference among the conceptions and challenges of citizenship education offered by the interviewees and the conceptions and challenges for citizenship education offered in the scholarly literature. While the majority of the discussions I had with interviewees yielded responses that focused on interpersonal relationships, diversity, ethical behaviours, obeying the law and consideration of the impact of personal decisions, many of the interviewees did not suggest how these issues could be extended or more deeply engaged by teachers and their students. The scholarly literature, on the other hand, focuses attention on a number of dimensions of citizenship that interviewees generally did not touch on: sovereignty, globalization, exploitation of limited resources, obligations to people living beyond conventional nation-state boundaries, as well as post-nation-state and global citizenship

(Banks, 2006; Callan, 1997; Castells, 2000; Giroux, 2005; Kahne et al., 2000; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994; McLaren & Farahmandpur, 2005; Noddings, 2005; Nussbaum, 1996; Olson & Lang, 2004; Osborne, 1997, 2001, 2005; Osler & Starkey, 2005; Richardson & Blades, 2006; Sears & Hughes, 1996; Smith, 2006; Westheimer & Kahne, 2004; Williams, 2003).

To what extent is it necessary or even possible to reconcile this disparity between what teachers believe are the challenges of citizenship education, and what education scholars, political theorists and philosophers believe are the central issues of citizenship education? Are there institutional impediments to expanding the notion of citizenship, such as over-emphasis of performance-oriented assessments and overloaded programs of study, too well entrenched to be easily overcome? Is there a sufficient desire in the community of stakeholders in public education, especially teachers, to more actively engage in a movement to expand citizenship education? Do those same stakeholders actually perceive the existence of these disparities?

In spite of the disparity that exists between what teachers said was the nature of citizenship and the role of citizenship education and the priorities and challenges facing citizenship and citizenship education according to scholars, there may be some value in reconciling the conceptions of citizenship offered by interviewees in this study with the challenges and complexities of citizenship that are revealed in the scholarly literature. Yet such a reconciliation is not solely intended to address a perceived deficiency in teachers understandings of citizenship, but for teachers, teacher educators, scholars, policy makers and curriculum designers to better understand and appreciate the differences between the life world of the classroom as it is lived by teachers and students,

and the same world as conceptualized by scholars, teacher educators and curriculum designers. How can teachers be encouraged to help students to be literate in the meta-narrative and encourage activism and agency? If teachers are not well-acquainted with many of the challenges and complexities of citizenship identified by the academy, are academics partially at fault for not appreciating the complexity, dynamism, challenges and issues that exist in the day-to-day life world of the classroom? It seems apparent that the disparity between teachers and scholars on the nature of citizenship and what it means to teach for good citizenship, means that the message about the currency and importance of each of these discourses is not getting through, or is encountering a range of resistances.

Encountering Resistance

All of the participants recognized the potential to make their subject areas into spaces for teaching for good citizenship, but virtually all of them also noted the means by which they believed that curriculum, both overtly and covertly, limits the possibilities of expanding, extending and deepening citizenship education by imposing time constraints and a performance-based regime of evaluations that have an impact on students and teachers. In most of my conversations with interviewees, I heard again and again that the program of studies was overloaded with outcomes and, because their own performance is implicitly evaluated through the performance of their students on standardized exams, teachers do not have sufficient time to expand or extend the curriculum beyond the perceived boundaries of what appears in official curriculum documents. Thus, most interviewees viewed the program of studies as the maximum set of outcomes to be achieved, rather than as a framework or starting point for teaching. This limits the

potential of the official curriculum to yield those malleable spaces where teachers have the opportunities to work with students to make the necessary connections between the outcomes in programs of study and the practice of good citizenship.

Recognizing Potential

To the extent that there are challenges and resistance to re-evaluating what it means to teach for good citizenship, all of the interviewees were interested in making further efforts to engage in deepening and broadening citizenship education. All of them believed that more attention needs to be given to teaching for good citizenship in their own classrooms and in teacher training programs; and, most agreed that practicing teachers could benefit from re-evaluating and reflecting on the nature of teaching for good citizenship in their own practice.

All of the interviewees considered themselves to be citizenship educators, whether or not they consciously call it that when they engage in their teaching practice. Further, they are all aware that preparing students for good citizenship is the implicit goal of public education. And, while there may be certain disparities between what teachers and scholars recognize as the central issues in citizenship education, some of the teachers I interviewed were personally concerned about some of the same central issues that are reflected in the scholarly literature, and these teachers try to find opportunities to share these concerns with students, but feel constrained by institutional impediments and chronologic resistance.

Reconciling Findings with Expectations

I am very grateful for the time that participants found to sit down with me for their interviews and the enthusiasm and interest they each expressed in the research

question and its implications for teaching practice. Interviewees offered some interesting insights into what it means to teach for good citizenship and engage in citizenship education, and each of them brought their own unique life and teaching experiences with them to the interview and I hope I have drawn that out my writing. Each interviewee's conception of citizenship and citizenship education yielded interesting insights into perceptions about teaching practice, the nature of curriculum, and the role schools play in the community.

With the exception of Caroline, interviewees did not necessarily seem troubled by the empty signifier / *catch-all* nature of citizenship, or the amorphous nature of citizenship education. All of the interviewees shared some commonalities in their understandings of citizenship, in spite of differences articulated over the general objectives of citizenship education. All of them considered that cultivating a climate of cooperation and peaceful coexistence was central to citizenship, and that citizenship education is connected with the development of critical thinking and the reconciliation of personal autonomy with the interests and cohesion of the community around them, issues central to liberal democracy. Further, citizenship education was about finding ground for recognizing and acknowledging diversity, engaging in intercultural dialogue and cultivating understanding and appreciation of difference. All of these are important and laudable objectives, and in spite of the absence of responses from interviewees that connected citizenship with nation-states, all of these issues are connected with the challenges faced by diverse liberal democratic nation-states.

Citizenship education scholars offered an array of challenges that they believe teachers need to be addressing in their classrooms related to fostering peace, cultivating

understanding across cultures, religions and diverse geographic settings. Many noted that humanity is confronted by environmental challenges on a global scale, and that the power and role of modern nation-states is being eroded away by corporate agendas and neoliberal instrumentalism. Exploitation of limited non-renewable resources and a culture of selfish consumption, self-centeredness and ambivalence aggravate these challenges. Ladson-Billings, Noddings, Nussbaum, Smith and many others identified in this thesis all write about these challenges and many more that they believe need to be addressed by both teachers and students. All of these challenges demand education, understanding, dialogue and activism to begin to find and implement solutions. And while the approaches to citizenship education offered to me by the interviewees expressed many challenges and expectations that they are already addressing or trying to address, there are so many more that need attention as well.

The solution is not to compound the burden that teachers already have, but to encourage them to deepen their understandings of the issues that they already recognize, and broaden their horizon to recognize that the issues they are already addressing in their classrooms are deeply and intricately interwoven with larger, complex, and important trans-national and global issues. Further the challenge for scholars, teacher-educators, curriculum designers and policy makers is to better understand the life world of teachers and their students, and appreciate that the issues that arise at the classroom level are more closely connected with the real lives of students.

What Next?

At the beginning of the process of researching and writing for this MEd thesis, I set out to discover how practicing teachers understood the notion of citizenship, and what

it means to teach for good citizenship. I had no intention of defining citizenship for the participants. On the contrary, I hoped I would find in the teachers I interviewed a range of meanings and understandings of citizenship and the recognition that the concept is exceptionally dynamic. Further, its dynamism and malleability is reflected in the scholarly literature. Yet the dynamism revealed in such a small study acknowledges the troubling nature of citizenship education and teaching for good citizenship, that the malleability and amorphousness make the concept exceptionally difficult to grasp, and creates the potential for critical audiences to tune out, failing to recognize and engage the possibilities of teaching for good citizenship.

What next? There are a wide variety of possible avenues of further investigation; among these are: broadening the scope of the study to include a larger number of teachers; a critical evaluation of the language in programs of study relating to overt and implied citizenship education outcomes; research and consideration of the nature of citizenship education within the context of teacher education.

Does the wider population of teachers in primary and secondary education share the same range of conceptions about what it means to teach for good citizenship? Is there a difference or disparity in these perceptions between religious and secular schools, and between schools in rural and urban settings, or between schools situated where their populations come from different socioeconomic strata?

How is the language of programs of study, especially in the context of citizenship education, perceived by teachers? In this study, interviewees all expressed a range of familiarity with the programs of study in the subject areas that they taught, and differing levels of awareness about implicit and explicit outcomes. With consideration to the

perception that programs of study are perceived as the set of maximum or ultimate outcomes, how can citizenship related outcomes be more clearly articulated in overt curriculum, or should they be articulated in this way? Could such outcomes be structured in such a way that the dynamism and potential of citizenship education is maintained? Or, would such clearly stated outcomes act to constrain and limit the potential for dialogue on citizenship?

One of the questions that I have been interested in from the beginning of this research is the issue of incorporation of citizenship education within teacher education programs, and the potential for the development and integration of teaching for good citizenship into all subject areas. What would such a program look like? Could citizenship education be defined in such a way that it is graspable, without overly constraining it? Is it too vast a concept to be captured in a unit or course?

What I have discovered through the process or researching and writing this thesis is that the potential for avenues of investigation in all of the domains of citizenship education is potentially limitless. My own understanding of citizenship's complexity is certainly deeper than it was at the beginning of this process, and I recognize that I have only begun to scratch the surface. The possibilities for expanding and deepening what it means to teach for good citizenship are vast, but as a teacher and scholar, I have an obligation to begin somewhere. I am cognisant that my contribution to this discourse is situated in a particular time and space, and while I am under no illusion that I will transform it significantly, I can help to map it and maybe and contribute to shaping the discourse in the future.

References

Alberta Education. (2005). *Program of studies: Social studies, kindergarten to grade 12.* Edmonton, AB: Alberta Education.

Arnot, M., & Dillabough, J.-A. (1999). Feminist politics and democratic values in education. *Curriculum Inquiry, 29*(2), 159 - 189.

Banks, J. A. (2001). Citizenship education and diversity: Implications for teacher education. *Journal of Teacher Education, 52*(1), 5 - 16.

Banks, J. A. (2004). Democratic citizenship education in multicultural societies. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Diversity and citizenship education: Global perspectives* (pp. 3 - 15). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Banks, J. A. (2006). *Cultural diversity and education: Foundations, curriculum, and teaching* (Fifth ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson Education.

Barber, B. R. (1996). Constitutional faith. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 31-37). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

Bassey, M. (1999). *Case study research in educational settings*. Buckingham, UK: Open University Press.

Callan, E. (1997). *Creating citizens: Political education and liberal democracy*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Callan, E. (2004). Citizenship and education. *Annual Review of Political Science, 7*, 71 - 90.

Carson, T. (2006). The lonely citizen: Democracy, curriculum, and the crisis of belonging. In G. H. Richardson & D. W. Blades (Eds.), *Troubling the canon of citizenship education* (pp. 25 - 30). New York: Peter Lang.

Case, R., Osborne, K., & Skau, K. (1998). National case studies of citizenship education: Canada. In J. J. Cogan & R. Derricott (Eds.), *Citizenship for the 21st century: An international perspective on education* (pp. 42-51). London, UK: Kogan Page.

Castells, M. (2000). The global economy. In D. Held & A. McGrew (Eds.), *The global transformational reader: An introduction to the globalization debate* (pp. 251 - 259). Cambridge, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2005). *Educational research: Planning, conducting, and evaluating quantitative and qualitative research* (Second ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education, Inc.

den Heyer, K. (2006). Defining presence as agents of social life and change. In G. Richardson & D. Blades (Eds.), *Troubling the canon of citizenship education* (pp. 85 - 94). New York: Peter Lang.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: The discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 1 - 28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Dillabough, J.-A. (2006). Gender theory and research in education: Modernist traditions and emerging contemporary themes. In M. Arnot & M. Mac an Ghaill (Eds.), *The routledgefalmer reader in gender and education* (pp. 17 - 32). London: Routledge.

Fine, M., Weis, L., Weseen, S., & Wong, L. (2000). For whom? Qualitative research, representations, and social responsibilities. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 107 - 132). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Fouts, J. T., & Lee, W. O. (2005). Concepts of citizenship: From personal rights to social responsibility. In W. O. Lee & J. T. Fouts (Eds.), *Education for social citizenship* (pp. 289). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Freire, P. (1994). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans. 20th ed.). New York: Continuum Publishing Company.

Giroux, H. A. (2005). Terrorism and the culture of permanent war: Democracy under siege. In M. A. Peters (Ed.), *Education, globalization, and the state in the age of terrorism* (pp. 179 - 199). Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.

Hahn, C. (1998). *Becoming political: Comparative perspective on citizenship education.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Heater, D. (1990). *Citizenship: The civic ideal in world history, politics and education.* Harlow, UK: Longman Group UK Limited.

Heater, D. (1992). The history of the concept of citizenship. *Curriculum, 13*(3), 149 - 157.

Heater, D. (2004). *A history of education for citizenship.* London: Routledge Falmer.

Held, D., McGrew, A., Goldblatt, D., & Perraton, J. (2000). Rethinking globalization. In D. Held & A. McGrew (Eds.), *The global transformation reader: An introduction to the globalization debate* (pp. 54 - 60). Cambridge, UK: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Hughes, A. (1994). Understanding citizenship: A Delphi study. *Canadian and International Education, 23*(2), 13 - 26.

Inwood, M. J. (1995). Frankfurt school. In T. Honderich (Ed.), *The Oxford companion to philosophy* (pp. 290). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Johnston, I. (2001). English language arts, citizenship and national identity, *Canadian Social Studies*: University of Alberta.

Kahne, J., Rodriguez, M., Smith, B., & Thiede, K. (2000). Developing citizens for democracy? Assessing opportunities to learn in Chicago's social studies classrooms. *Theory and Research in Social Education, 28*(3), 311 - 338.

Kellner, D. (2005). The conflicts of globalization and restructuring of education. In M. A. Peters (Ed.), *Education, globalization, and the state in the age of terrorism* (pp. 31 - 69). Boulder, Co: Paradigm Publishers.

Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (1999). Rethinking critical theory an qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 279 - 314). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Kubow, P., Grossman, D., & Ninomaya, A. (1998). Multidimensional citizenship: Educational policy for the 21st century. In J. J. Cogan & R. Derricott (Eds.), *Citizenship for the 21st century* (pp. 115-134). London: Kogan Page.

Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship*. Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press.

Kymlicka, W. (2001). *Politics in the vernacular: Nationalism, multiculturalism and citizenship*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Kymlicka, W., & Norman, W. (1994). Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics, 104*(January 1994), 352 -381.

Ladson-Billings, G. (2005). Differing concepts of citizenship: Schools and communities as sites of civic development. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 69 - 80). New York: Teachers College Press.

Lee, W. O. (2005). Cross-national comparisons and conclusions: Teachers' perceptions toward social citizenship. In W. O. Lee & J. T. Fouts (Eds.), *Education for social citizenship: Perceptions of teachers in the USA, Australia, England, Russia and China* (pp. 289). Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Macintosh, L. B., & Loutzenheiser, L. W. (2006). Queering citizenship. In G. Richardson & D. Blades (Eds.), *Troubling the canon of citizenship education* (pp. 95 - 102). New York: Peter Lang.

Marshall, T. H. (1973). *Class, citizenship, and social development*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Mazzoni, D., Haberman, J., Brubeck, M., Crook, J., Johnson, V., Meyer, M., et al. (2004). Audacity (Version 1.2.2) [Freeware].

McLaren, P., & Farahmandpur, R. (2005). *Teaching against global capitalism and the new imperialism: A critical pedagogy*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc.

McLellan, D. (1995). Hegemony. In T. Honderich (Ed.), *The Oxford companion to philosophy* (pp. 344). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. (2005). Citizenship. Retrieved August 4, 2006, from http://www.m-w.com/cgi-bin/dictionary?book=Dictionary&va=citizenship&x=19&y=13

Merriam, S. B. (1998). *Qualitative research and case study applications in education.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey- Bass Publishers.

Noddings, N. (2005). Global citizenship: Promises and problems. In N. Noddings (Ed.), *Educating citizens for global awareness* (pp. 1 - 21). New York: Teachers College Press.

Nussbaum, M. C. (1996). Patriotism and cosmopolitanism. In J. Cohen (Ed.), *For love of country: Debating the limits of patriotism* (pp. 3 - 17). Boston, MA: Beacon Press.

OED Online. (1989). Citizen. 2nd Edition. Retrieved August 4, 2006, from http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50040478?query_type=word&queryword=citizen&first=1&max_to_show=10&sort_type=alpha&result_place=1&search_id=EcCY-5NhERI-5146&hilite=50040478

OED Online. (1989). Citizenship. 2nd Edition. Retrieved August 4, 2006, from http://dictionary.oed.com/cgi/entry/50040486?query_type=word&queryword=citizenship&first=1&max_to_show=10&single=1&sort_type=alpha

Olson, J., & Lang, M. (2004). Science and technology and the didactics of citizenship. *Journal of Curriculum Studies, 36*(5), 543 -553.

Osborne, K. (1997). Citizenship education and social studies. In I. Wright & A. Sears (Eds.), *Trends and issues in Canadian social studies* (pp. 39 - 67). Vancouver, BC: Pacific Educational Press.

Osborne, K. (2001). Public schooling and citizenship education in Canada. In R. Bruno-Jofré & N. Aponiuk (Eds.), *Educating citizens for a pluralistic society* (pp. 11 - 48). Calgary, AB: McAra Printing Ltd.

Osborne, K. (2005). Political education and citizenship: Teaching for civic engagement. *Education Canada [H.W. Wilson - EDUC], 45*(1), 13 - 16.

Osler, A., & Starkey, H. (2005). *Changing citizenship: Democracy and inclusion in education*. Maidenhead, UK: Open University Press.

Richardson, G., & Blades, D. (2001). Social studies and science education: Developing world citizenship through interdisciplinary partnerships, *Canadian Social Studies*: University of Alberta.

Richardson, G., & Blades, D. (2006). Restarting the interrupted discourse of the public good: Global citizenship education as moral imperative. In G. Richardson & D. Blades (Eds.), *Troubling the canon of citizenship education* (pp. 115 - 123). New York: Peter Lang.

Richardson, G., Blades, D., Kumano, Y., & Karaki, K. (2003). Fostering a global imaginary: The possibilities and paradoxes of Japanese and Canadian students' perceptions of the responsibilities of world citizenship. *Policy Futures in Education, 1x*(2), 402 - 420.

Rizvi, F. (2003). Democracy and education after September 11. *Globalisation, Societies and Education, 1*(1), 25 - 40.

Rizvi, F. (2004). Debating globalization and education after September 11. *Comparative Education, 40*(2), 156 - 171.

Schwandt, T. A. (2000). Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 189 - 214). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Sears, A., Clarke, G. M., & Hughes, A. (1999). Canadian citizenship education: The pluralist ideal and citizenship education for a post-modern state. In J. Torney-Putra, J. Schwille & J.-A. Amadeo (Eds.), *Civic education across countries: Twenty-four national case studies from the iea civic education project* (pp. 111 - 136). Delft, NL: Eburon Publishers.

Sears, A., & Hughes, A. (1996). Citizenship education and current educational reform. *Canadian Journal of Education, 21*(2), 123.

Sears, A., & Hyslop-Margison, E. J. (2006). The cult of citizenship education. In G. H. Richardson & D. W. Blades (Eds.), *Troubling the canon of citizenship education* (pp. 13 - 24). New York: Peter Lang, Inc.

Shields, P. N., & Ramsay, D. (2004). Social studies across English Canada. In A. Sears & I. Wright (Eds.), *Challenges and prospects for Canadian social studies* (pp. 38 - 54). Vancouver, BC: Pacific Education Press.

Silverman, D. (1999). Analyzing talk and text. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 821 - 834). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Inc.

Simmt, E. (2001). Citizenship education in the context of school mathematics, *Canadian Social Studies*. University of Alberta: University of Alberta.

Smith, D. G. (2003). On enfraudening the public sphere, the futility of empire and the future of knowledge after 'America'. *Policy Futures in Education, 1*(3), 488 - 503.

Smith, D. G. (2006). Troubles with the sacred canopy: Global citizenship in a season of great untruth. In G. Richardson & D. Blades (Eds.), *Troubling the canon of citizenship education* (pp. 124 - 135). New York: Peter Lang.

Smith, D. G. (2006). *Trying to teach in a season of great untruth: Globalization, empire and the crises of pedagogy*. Rotterdam: Sense Publishers.

Smits, H. (2006). "weak ontology" as a way of reenchanting citizenship in the social studies. In G. Richardson & D. Blades (Eds.), *Troubling the canon of citizenship education* (pp. 55 - 66). New York: Peter Lang.

Stake, R. E. (2000). Case studies. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2nd ed., pp. 435 - 454). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, inc.

Strike, K. A. (1998). Freedom of conscience and illiberal socialization: The congruence argument. *The Journal of Philosophy of Education*(32), 3.

Tupper, J. (2005). *Searching citizenship: Social studies and the tensions of teaching.* University of Alberta, Edmonton.

Tupper, J. (2006). Education and the (im)possibilities of citizenship. In G. H. Richardson & D. W. Blades (Eds.), *Troubling the canon of citizenship education* (pp. 45 - 54). New York: Peter Lang.

U.S. Supreme Court. (1964). Jacobellis v. Ohio, 378 U.S. 184.http://laws.findlaw.com/us/378/184.html: Findlaw.com.

Westheimer, J., & Kahne, J. (2004). What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. *American Educational Research Journal, 41*(2), 237-269.

Williams, M. S. (2003). Citizenship as identity, citizenship as shared fate, and the functions of multicultural education. In K. McDonough & W. Feinberg (Eds.), *Citizenship and education in liberal-democratic societies: Teaching for cosmopolitan values and collective identities* (pp. 208 - 247). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Willinsky, J. (1998). *Learning to divide the world: Education at empire's end.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Appendix A

October 18, 2005

Dear [redacted] Teachers:

I am writing to invite you to participate in a research project entitled, "Practicing Teachers as Citizenship Educators." The purpose of this research project is to begin to appreciate the potentially diverse understandings of the notion of citizenship among public school teachers in all subject areas, and to reflect on the possible influences that shaped each teacher's understanding of that concept. Further, the central goal of the research project seeks to examine how each teacher's own understanding of citizenship impacts their own professional practice in the classroom. These interviews will play a central role in the research for my master's thesis.

You will be asked to engage in a semi-structured interview, approximately one hour in length. The interview will consist of a series of questions that will guide you and the researcher through a discussion on the role of teachers as citizenship educators. **A total of six participants, representing as many subject areas as possible will be interviewed for this project**. All interviews will be audio-taped, and subsequently transcribed.

I realize that your time is very valuable. My schedule allows a great deal of flexibility in order to accommodate the schedule of participants.

All of the data gathered in this research project will be handled in compliance with the University of Alberta Standards for the Protection of Human Research Participants, Section 66 of the GFC Policy Manual. The text of the GFC policy document is available at **http://www.ualberta.ca/~unisecr/policy/sec66.html**. Names of all participants will be changed to ensure anonymity. All information collected, including documents, tapes, CD-ROMs, and transcripts, will be kept for a minimum of five years following the completion of the project, in a secure, locked cabinet.

You may withdraw from this project at any time without any negative consequences. Any information related to your participation would be destroyed, and not used within the thesis, or subsequent publications or presentations.

The plan for this study has been reviewed for its adherence to ethical guidelines and approved by the Faculty of Education and Extension Research Ethics Board (EE REB) at the University of Alberta. For questions regarding participant rights and ethical conduct of research, contact the Chair of the EE REB at (780)492-3751. It has also been approved by the [redacted]. Please contact me with any questions or concerns regarding this research project, at [redacted] or (780)492-2902, or by email at **laurence.abbott@ualberta.ca**, or contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. George H. Richardson, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta at (780) 492-4980 or by email at **george.richardson@ualberta.ca**

Sincerely,

Laurence Abbott

Appendix B

Consent Form

Practicing Teachers as Citizenship Educators

I, _____, hereby consent
(Please print name)
to participate in the "Practicing Teachers as Citizenship Educators" research project, undertaken by Laurence Abbott, a Master of Education student in the Department of Secondary Education at the University of Alberta. Participation in this study involves the following activities:

- a one-hour interview on my attitude and understanding of the notion of citizenship, and my role as a citizenship educator
- a brief written reflection
- a brief follow-up interview

I understand that;

- I may withdraw from the research at any time without penalty.
- all information gathered will be treated confidentially.
- any information that identifies me will be destroyed upon completion of this research.
- I will not be identifiable in any documents resulting from this research.

I also understand that the results of this research will be used only for the researchers master's thesis, and in written articles and presentations.

_____
(Signature)

_____
(Date)

If you have any questions or concerns about this research project, please contact Laurence Abbott at (780)492-2902, or at **laurence.abbott@ualberta.ca.** or contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. George H. Richardson, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta at (780) 492-4980 or by email at **george.richardson@ualberta.ca**

Appendix C

Practicing Teachers as Citizenship Educators

Time of interview:

Date:

Place:

Interviewer: Laurence Abbott

Interviewee:

Interviewee Code:

Purpose of the Research Project

One of the central aims of public education is to guide students in the shaping of their own understanding of citizenship, and thus, teachers in all disciplines have a critical responsibility to provide that guidance and maintain an appropriate environment for the cultivation of good citizenship in their students. Yet, the nature of the term citizenship, especially in the context of educating for citizenship, is remarkably difficult to define. It ranges from narrow social contract conceptions of rights, duties and responsibilities, to much broader notions of belonging to a global community.

Schools play a critical role in modeling behaviors and in shaping the way students interact with each other and how they participate and engage with the various communities to which they belong. Consideration needs to be given to whether teaching for good citizenship sufficiently emphasizes moral and ethical decision making skills, and models values and behaviors consistent with a free and democratic society, as well as a progressively global community.

The purpose of this research project is to begin to appreciate the potentially diverse understandings of the notion of citizenship among public school teachers, and to reflect on the possible influences that shaped each teacher's understanding of that concept. Further, the central goal of the research project seeks to examine how each teacher's own understanding of citizenship impacts their professional practice in the classroom.

Research project objectives

- To gain an appreciation for the degree of priority and prominence of citizenship education within high school classrooms and to consider the extent that teachers in core subjects consider themselves to be citizenship educators.
- To consider potential avenues for further research on the need for pre-service and in-service citizenship education programs for teachers.

. The researcher for this project is Laurence Abbott, a student in the Master of Education program (thesis-based) in the Department of Secondary Education, at the University of Alberta. Data gathered from this research project will play a central role in his master's thesis, and may be used in presentations and in articles written for academic or professional journals.

All of the data gathered in this research project will be handled in compliance with the University of Alberta Standards for the Protection of Human Research Participants, Section 66 of the GFC Policy Manual. The text of the GFC policy document is available at **http://www.ualberta.ca/~unisecr/policy/sec66.html**. Names of all participants will be changed to ensure anonymity. All information collected, including documents, tapes, CD-ROMs, and transcripts, will be kept for a minimum of five years following the completion of the project, in a secure, locked cabinet.

You may withdraw from this project at any time without any negative consequences. Any information related to your participation would be destroyed, and not used within the thesis, or subsequent publications or presentations.

The plan for this study has been reviewed for its adherence to ethical guidelines and approved by the Faculty of Education and Extension Research Ethics Board (EE REB) at the University of Alberta. For questions regarding participant rights and ethical conduct of research, contact the Chair of the EE REB at (780)492-3751. It has also been approved by the [redacted]. Please contact Laurence Abbott with any questions or concerns regarding this research project, at [redacted] or (780)492-2902, or by email at **laurence.abbott@ualberta.ca**, or contact my thesis supervisor, Dr. George H. Richardson, Department of Secondary Education, University of Alberta at (780) 492-4980 or by email at **george.richardson@ualberta.ca**

1. **What is citizenship education, and where does it fit into the curriculum?**

    a. How do you define citizenship, personally?

        i. Is it different from *good citizenship?* How?

    b. Does it have a particular home in the curriculum?

        i. Is that the appropriate place for it?

        ii. Is that a satisfactory place for it?

    c. What sorts of skills and abilities do students need to develop to engage topics and issues that have a significant social, cultural, political and economic impact?

    d. How are teachers, regardless of discipline, preparing students to make critical decision on products they consume, and on how they engage with each other, and with the communities to which they belong?

    e. How are teachers, regardless of discipline, preparing students to engage in responsible, socially conscious behaviour?

    f. Do you believe that teachers are effectively encouraging students to be activist-citizens and critical thinkers?

        i. Is there a mixed message in our approach to citizenship education? Are some students encouraged to be activist-citizens while others are encouraged to conform?

        ii. Are classrooms being effectively used as a venue for critical consideration of knowledge, or is knowledge treated as a commodity, unquestionable and empirical?

2. **How do events in the communities that you belong to, from local through global, shape the ways in which you engage in your teaching practice?**

3. **What influences shaped your understanding of citizenship, and has your understanding of citizenship changed over time**

    a. If your own understanding of citizenship has changed over time, how, and why did it change?

b. How do you believe your media choices may impact your own perception of citizenship and the importance of citizenship education?

c. Have you ever deeply questioned or considered the assumptions that form the foundation of our liberal democratic notion of citizenship?

4. How does citizenship education fit into your subject area and into your classroom practice?

a. Does citizenship education fit into your subject area?

b. Do you every think of yourself as a citizenship educator?

c. How are notions or concepts related to citizenship education reflected in the program of studies in your discipline?

i. Do you perceive that a gap exists between the rhetoric of citizenship education in the program of studies and the practice of citizenship education?

d. Do issues of citizenship or *good citizenship* ever come up in your classroom?

i. Have there been 'teachable moments' when you had the opportunity to discuss with your students an issue that has significant citizenship education attributes or another citizenship education dimension?

e. Do discussions of morality or ethics ever come up in your classroom discussions?

i. Do ethics and moral education have a place within your subject area?

ii. Do ethics and moral education have a place within citizenship education in your classroom? How might they be related?

f. Are there ways you can think of to incorporate a greater role for citizenship education in the subject area you teach?

g. Do issues such as globalization or questions of ideology ever come up in your classroom, even if they are well outside your subject area or expertise?

i. How are your preparing students for a world that in which they will be confronted on a daily basis with challenges that go beyond the personal or immediate needs and desires of the individual?

h. Are there or might there be risks you are willing to undertake to give real meaning to citizenship education?

i. Are you willing to look into how to expand the role that citizenship education plays in your classroom?

j. Do you believe that you are empowering students to think critically about citizenship?

5. What is a democratic classroom?

a. How are rules established in your classroom?

i. What role are rules expected to play in your classroom?

ii. Do students play a role in developing those rules or enforcing them?

iii. Are there different kinds of rules for different classes, different courses, different streams?

iv. How are the rules articulated to students?

v. Are any rules posted? Not posted? Unwritten?

vi. Are penalties outlined?

vii. Do you believe that you are a fair and equitable arbiter of justice in your classroom?

b. Is your classroom a democratic space?

i. Is your classroom a democratic place?

ii. To what degree do you encourage collaboration and cooperation?

iii. What means do you use to encourage tolerance and respect among students

iv. To what degree do students participate in decision making in your classroom?

v. Are there areas where you are willing to share authority and jurisdiction?

c. Schools and classrooms are typically rule-bound spaces; some schools have long lists of rules, regulations and codes of conduct. In your experience, how rigidly are these enforced?

i. Is enforcement effective?

ii. How often do rules seem to be applied unequally or unjustly?

d. Is part of the job of a teacher to model democratic behaviours?

e. How effective do you believe teachers are in modelling democratic behaviours?

i. Do you believe that this has an impact on the democratic/participatory behaviour of students?

6. Should citizenship education enjoy greater prominence in programs-of-study in your discipline?

a. Is the presence of citizenship education explicitly defined in the program-of-studies in your discipline?

i. Is it implied or suggested in any fashion?

ii. Should it be?

b. Where should citizenship education be situated within the curriculum in general?

c. Might citizenship education be perceived by teachers as just one more thing on their plate?

7. How prepared do you believe you are to actively engage in citizenship education in your discipline?

a. Are you at all familiar with any current work or research on citizenship theory, and it place in education?

b. How about older scholarship such as Dewey, I.H. Marshall?

c. Are you comfortable that the education system is adequately working to shape students ability to function as a good citizen in the world?

d. What means could be used to encourage teachers to make their classrooms into spaces for active citizenship education?

e. Do you believe that practicing teachers might benefit from in-service training to help them to become better citizenship educators?

f. Do you believe that pre-service teacher would benefit from a course or unit focussed on making them better citizenship educators?

g. Do you believe that you would benefit/have benefited from such a program?

h. Where should the burden lie in integrating citizenship education into the curriculum? (teachers, school/district, province)

i. Should Alberta Education develop supplemental materials in each discipline, to help teachers make their subject area a good space for citizenship education?